The Mennonite Quarterly Review

VOLUME XXVI July 1952 NUMBER THREE

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 170

THE INNER AND OUTER WORD: A STUDY IN THE ANABAPTIST DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE 171
Wilhelm Wiswedel, Bayreuth, Germany

THE WISDOM OF CHRIST AND THE CULTURE OF MAN: THE THEOLOGY OF WAR AND ITS CULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS 192
Don. E. Smucker, Mennonite Biblical Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

PETER RIEDEMANN ON ORIGINAL SIN AND THE WAY OF REDEMPTION 210
Robert Friedmann, Western Michigan College

THE HISTORY OF THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S BIBLE MEETING IN THE MENNONITE CHURCH 216
Paul M. Lederach, Scottdale, Pa.

MENNONITES IN LYON COUNTY, KANSAS: 1880-90: A MEMOIR 232
John Umble, Goshen College

Book Reviews 254
Explorations in Altruistic Love and Behavior. A symposium edited by Pitirim A. Sorokin.
Reviewed by H. Clair Amstutz

John C. Wenger, *Separated Unto God*
Reviewed by J. Winfield Fretz

EDITORIAL

The Anabaptists were pre-eminently the Church of the Bible in the Reformation. Although all the reformers made the Bible the sole authority for faith and life, yet it was the Anabaptists who most thoroughly and consistently applied the principle. In fact they have been called Biblicists, sometimes critically in the sense that they were such literalists that they slavishly followed the letter of Scripture and fell into legalism. On the other hand the Anabaptists have also been accused of emphasizing the "inner word" so much that they were unfaithful to the outer word, the Bible, and used direct inspiration from God as a source of truth and authority, in this sense being spiritualists.

Pastor W. Wiswedel of Bayreuth, Germany, whose splendid studies on the Anabaptists in his *Bilder und Führergestalten* have demonstrated his scholarship, has made a definitive study of the Anabaptist doctrine of Scripture, primarily with reference to the Swiss, South German, and Hutterian Anabaptists, which the Review is happy to present in this issue under the title "The Inner and Outer Word." It is a comprehensive work, buttressed by abundant citations from the sources, and should resolve the debate over the Anabaptist position on Scripture once for all. Similar abundant evidence could be cited to show that Menno Simons and the Dutch and North German Anabaptists held a similar clear-cut position.

The Christian's stand against war may take two shapes: he may reject all participation in war out of a simple reading of the Gospel and discipleship to Christ, making the act of nonparticipation his sole testimony against war; or he may attempt with all the resources of modern scientific sociological analysis to understand war and the mind of those who practice and support it in our time, and combining this analysis with his reading of the Gospel, enter into the arena of contemporary thought with his aggressive testimony, calling upon every weapon in his armory to convince men of the folly, futility and wickedness of war, and to bring them to the Christian way of redemption and discipleship.

In his paper "The Wisdom of Christ and the Culture of Man," Don Smucker has chosen the latter course, a most difficult one, but one which must be undertaken if the maximum power of the Christian peacemaker is to be brought to bear upon the current situation. With trenchant, keen interpretation and evaluation he treats three current varieties of the moralistic-secular view of war, in a cultural and historical study, challenging its basic view that war is rationally controllable, ethically neutral, and culturally autonomous. His conclusion, on the basis of the evidence from social science, that war is evil and satanic and that optimism about its ethical neutrality and its controllability for relatively good objectives is unfounded, is brilliantly supported. This is a major contribution to the debate among Christians over the war question. It was prepared as a paper for the Commission on the Christian Conscience and War established by the Church Peace Mission.

Robert Friedmann further explores the still virgin field of Anabaptist theology in this issue in his brief study of Peter Riedemann's teaching on "Original Sin" reprinting the entire section on this subject as found in the *Rechenschaft.*

A significant factor in the progress of the Mennonite Church in time of the great awakening was the Sunday evening meeting known usually as the Young People's Meeting. Paul Lederach's paper in this issue, a chapter out of his doctoral dissertation on *The History of Religious Education in the Mennonite Church,* is the first scholarly study in the field. It clearly portrays the origin (1887-1895) and development, problems, and curriculum growth of this activity. Called a Young People's Meeting, and intended to promote the interest and growth of young people in the Christian faith, life, and service, it was actually much more. It was, in effect, the lay discussion meeting of the church, where many lay members both older and younger had opportunity for participation and activity, thus paralleling and supplementing the Sunday school. It was a meeting of, by, and for the entire congregation and thus followed a radically different course from the Christian Endeavor and similar youth meetings in other denominations.

Personal Memoirs have a unique historical value. Not only are they authentic eyewitness accounts, but they bring a wealth of detail and vividness not possible in formal historical essays. When they contribute historical material otherwise unrecorded they are doubly valuable. The Review is happy to publish such a personal memoir by John Umble telling of the early days of a pioneer frontier Amish Mennonite settlement in Kansas long since extinct but whose struggles and tribulations were very real and significant to those who attempted its establishment.

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

VOLUME XXVI JULY 1952 NUMBER THREE

THE INNER AND THE OUTER WORD

A Study in the Anabaptist Doctrine of Scripture

WILHELM WISWEDEL

The terms "inner Word" and "outer Word" were once used to designate the written and unwritten Word of God. In the place of "inner Word" the terms "illumination" or "inner voice" were often used. These expressions are by no means an invention of the Anabaptists or Spiritualists of the Reformation period. They appear in Augustine's book *Tolle Lege,* from which a Pietist of the 18th century quotes, "The sound of our word strikes your ears, but the Master is within you."[1] Likewise the medieval mystics, Bernhard Tauler, Thomas à Kempis, Ruysbroeck, Gerhard Groote, Catherine of Siena, etc., heard the inner and immediate voice of God in the stillness. A "Friend of God" called the attention of the "pious, gentle" Tauler, who "possessed a good knowledge of the Bible," to the fact that "he did not yet possess and live by the light of the grace of God and was therefore a Pharisee."[2] Thomas à Kempis in his *Imitatio* also speaks of "inner illumination," though he does not at all despise the outer Word. He had the courage, in defiance of the pope, to recommend the Bible as the highest light to those who would be happy. He made four copies of the Bible for distribution.[3] Bishop Berthold Pirstinger, the author of *Deutsche*

[1] Cf. Frido Braun, *Johann Tannhardt, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pietismus* (1934), 97 ff.

[2] Cf. Tränendorf—Metzler, *Kirchengeschichtliches Lesebuch,* 3d ed., 127.

[3] August Werner, *Die Helden der christlichen Kirche* (Leipzig, 1904), 123.

Theologie[4] also has much to say about "inner illumination" or the "true light," especially in chapters 39-44. Luther rated this booklet very high. Peter Chelcicky speaks of the divine light that is lighted in us through the Holy Spirit: "Faith is a light that God lights in the heart."[5] In this way only does "the birth of God in the depths of the soul" occur. Luther, as Karl Holl remarked, at times stressed the need for the Holy Spirit so strongly that his expressions seem to approach fanaticism, when he says, for instance, "Everyone shall therefore believe that it is the Word of God when he feels within him that the Bible is true. The heart speaks: this is true, even if I should die one hundred deaths for it." It was therefore his idea "that basically every outward authority that seeks to be accepted inwardly needs an inner organ in man that convinces him of the truth of what is offered, the witness of the Holy spirit."[6] Luther bases this concept in part on the verse in the Psalms, "I will hear what God Himself speaks in me." "It could not be comprehended by anyone but such a quiet, reflecting spirit."[7] In his *Beschluss* following the exposition of the Gospel passage for *Dreikönigstag* the reformer says, "It is an endless word and must be understood and meditated upon with a quiet spirit as the Psalm says, I will hear what God Himself says within me. No one can comprehend it except such a quiet, meditating spirit."[8] This indicates that for Luther, who was strongly influenced by the mystics on this point, experience is the beginning of the knowledge of the divine character of the Scripture. On the other hand his opposition to the "enthusiasts," who strongly emphasized the "inner light" or "inner word," led him to protest against their view that God gives His Spirit in other ways than through the "outer" word. Word and Spirit he put on the same level. God works with man only through the word of Scripture.[9] Luther thereby begins the chorus of voices who to our very day have charged that the Anabaptists disavowed the written Word of God, expecting everything of the "inner Word" or that they "wanted

[4] The author was not, as has been assumed since Luther, a Frankfurt Friend of God, but according to the most recent investigations Bishop Berthold Pirstinger of Chiemsee, "who wrote it to comply with the wish of his archbishop, Lang, with the twofold purpose of opposing the spread of Lutheranism and to stimulate the clergy of Bavaria to theological thinking." (Cf. Richard Mertz, *Entwickelungsgeschichte des Protestantismus im Bergtesgadner Land*, 1933, and Friedrich Selle, *Schicksalsbuch der Evangel. Kirche in Oesterreich*, 1928, 249 ff.

[5] As in his most important work, *Das Netz des Glaubens*, published by Friedrich Baun.

[6] Cf. *Luther und die Schwärmer*, 1st ed., 218.

[7] *Ibid.*, 567.

[8] Cited from *Mitteilungen aus der Studentenbewegung*, 1927-28, No. 1, 4.

[9] *Luthers Werke (Volksausgabe)*, Vol. III, 68f.; vol. VI, 395.

to be sharp judges between the Spirit and the letter," or "they valued the inner Word at the expense of the written Word." Let Melanchthon lead the series. At the close of his *Verlegung etlicher unchristlicher Artikel, welche die Wiedertäufer fürgeben* (1536), he says, "Disregard for the outer Word and the Scripture is blasphemy. . . . Therefore the temporal arm of government shall watch here too and not tolerate this blasphemy, but earnestly resist and punish it."[10] Justus Menius says, "No Scriptures are of any consequence, but alone divine dreams, visions, and heavenly revelations, through which the glory of God speaks to and deals with these saints, teaching them things far higher, holier, more spiritual, and more ineffable than are to be found in the Scriptures."[11] The theologians of the university of Marburg asserted that the Anabaptist preacher Melchior Rinck held a doctrine of disparagement of the written Word as spiritless literalism, common to the sectarians.[12] The 1527 booklet *Getreue Warnung der Prediger des Evangeliums zu Strassburg, so Jakob Kautz, Prediger zu Worms, hat ausgehen lassen* says, "All their teaching leads to the idea that the Scripture is of no account."[13] Urbanus Rhegius says, "As the Anabaptist abbot indicates, your spirit is unwilling to submit to the Scriptures, and with reason, for if the Scriptures are to stand, then your spirit lies in the mud. *Summa:* Anabaptists cannot and will not endure the Scripture."[14] The *Bedenken der Wiedertäufer halben,* which is identical with *Prozess, wie es soll gehalten werden mit den Wiedertäufern* (1557), says, "Fourth error: God makes Himself known without consideration of the outer Word and without the sacrament."[15] In recent times it was especially Darl Holl,[16] H. Böhmer,[17] and Lydia Müller,[18] who have revived the assertion that the Anabaptists were the spiritual descendants of Thomas Müntzer, that the Spirit rather than the written Word is the highest authority for them, that revelations in addition to the Scripture are needed, and that the spiritual man can therefore dispense with the Bible.

[10] Cf. Wilhelm Wiswedel, *Bilder und Führergestalten aus dem Täufertum,* I (Cassel, 1928), 104.

[11] *Der Wiedertäufer Lehre und Geheimnis* (Wittenberg, 1530); Cf. Paul Wappler, *Die Täuferbewegung in Thüringen* (Jena, 1913), 64.

[12] *Ibid.,* 54.

[13] Brünn, *Mährisches Landesarchiv,* Beck Collection, No. 76, 15.

[14] *Wider den neuen Tauforden* (Augsburg, 1527), Page B.

[15] Cf. Gustav Bossert, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer,* vol. I: Württemberg (Leipzig, 1930), 163.

[16] *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte,* vol. I, 2nd ed. (1923).

[17] *Thomas Müntzer und das jüngste Deutschland* (1927), 187-222.

[18] *Der Kommunismus der mährischen Wiedertäufer. Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte,* XLV (Leipzig, 1927), No. 1 (142), 16, 18, 27, 74, 75.

Thus Lydia Müller writes concerning the Hutterites, "The esteem for the word of Scripture found among the Swiss Brethren, and especially with Hubmaier, recedes with Müntzer and the Hutterian Brethren in favor of personal revelation, the 'inner Word' which man receives from God in the depths of his soul." "Müntzer's doctrine of the inner Word, which separated him from Luther, has been passed on to the Hutterites almost without alteration." According to Lydia Müller, Hutterite theology does not hold that the Scripture is the *regula fidei,* but rather "the Spirit, which speaks to man in the depths of his soul."

But are these charges made against the Anabaptists really justified in the light of historical facts? Did the Anabaptists really despise the written Word or overemphasize the "inner word" at the expense of historical revelation? Did they really desire to be "sharp judges between the spirit and the letter," as Luther charges. Let us hear what they themselves say—Swiss Brethren, Hutterites, Mennonites, and the group around Hubmaier. Müntzer and the Münsterites do not enter the picture, as many important historians and even the contemporary government of Ulrich of Württemberg have recognized and stated.[19] Hubmaier's (d. 1528) high estimation of the Scripture is well known. In his *Preislied des gottlichen Wortes* each of the eighteen stanzas contains the line, "For God's Word will stand forever." The Holy Scripture is for him the straightedge by which all spiritual things are decided: it is the touchstone by which all doctrine should be tested. God's Word alone should be the judge. It is clear that Hubmaier means the entire written and printed Bible. Nothing should be added to or subtracted from the word of Christ." "One must bring Scripture, Scripture; that will sound the harp of David." "I consider the Scripture to be a Hercules." "I call upon heaven and earth to bear witness that I have faithfully said, cursed is he who dissolves the slightest word and does not say amen to it." "The Word of God stands firm as a stone wall." "The Scripture is the friend of God in which Jesus lives, dwells, and rests; there is no spot in it." In his *Christliche Lehrtafel* Hubmaier speaks of the "inner and outer drawing by God." He does not put them side by side independent of each other, but makes the one the result of the other. The "outer drawing" precedes; it takes place through the public proclamation of the written Word. From it comes the "inner drawing." Thus God has enlightened man also inwardly in his soul, "that it may under-

[19] Gustav Bossert, *op. cit.,* XI, and No. 69, 79.

stand the irresistible truth, convinced by the Spirit of God and the spoken Word, so that one must in his own conscience confess that it is true and that it cannot be otherwise." "The Word of God is water to all those who thirst for salvation and is made alive in us through the Spirit of God, without whose work it is only a dead letter."[20] "Do you have Zwingli's word, we want God's Word!" was the cry of the Zürich Anabaptists according to Kessler.[21] Ambrose Spittlemayer, who died a martyr's death in Kadolzburg near Fürth, held the written Word to be the "indubitable Word of God," which he has taught everywhere. The Bible is a rich source of comfort for all who live Christian lives.[22] Hans Nadler of Erlangen confessed that the Word of God had moved him to begin a new life and be baptized upon his faith. Three verses have seized him and would not leave him. And in whatever country he entered he preached from the Word of God to the people on the streets and in the inns. In Schrobenhausen, Bavaria, some Anabaptists were arrested and imprisoned for reading the Bible in a home.[23] In Augsburg about sixty Anabaptists were sitting together in a cellar, listening to Hans Leupold and Jörg von Passau read the Bible and explain what they read.[24] Hans Schlaffer, a former priest, declared at his trial, "So I say and swear like Paul: 'God is my witness in my conscience that . . . I hold the written Gospel of faith in Christ in high esteem.' "[25] Veit Grünberger, a Hutterite missionary, remarked in a letter to Peter Walpot, "I hope to be able to learn 100 chapters of the testament by heart. If I had had the Testament before, I have no doubt that I would know it from memory. Temptation makes one pay attention to the word."[26] When the Hutterite Onoffrius was seized in the Tirol in 1538 a New Testament was found in his pocket.[27] Thomas von Imbroich said in his confession before the court at Cologne (*ca.* 1556), "The Scripture can not be broken, nor shall anything be added to or subtracted from the Word. It is God's Word, which remains in eternity."[28] Mattias Servaes wrote in prison to a brother asking him to send his wife,

[20] Cf. Wilhelm Wiswedel, *Balthasar Hubmaier* (Cassel, 1939), 14, 15, 27-29, 31-33, 39.

[21] Cf. Paul Burckhardt, *Die Basler Täufer* (Basel, 1898), 43.

[22] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, II, 42, 44.

[23] *Ibid.*, 57.

[24] *Ibid.*, 62.

[25] Wiswedel, *Bilder und Führergestalten*, II, 194.

[26] Codex Michnay, Bratislava, Fol. 514.

[27] Johann Loserth, *Der Anabaptismus in Tirol* (*Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*), LXXIX (Vienna, 1891), 137.

[28] T. J. van Braght, *Martyrs' Mirror* (Scottdale, 1950), 367.

who was not yet in prison, a Dutch New Testament, since she was unable to read German.[29] Johannes Bair of Lichtenfels, who was held in the Bamberg prison twenty-three years until he died, asked his brethren to send him a Bible, for he had lacked a Bible for many years and had a great thirst for the Lord.[30] Wolfgang Vogel, a former priest in Eltersdorf near Erlangen, was deprived of his Bible when he was imprisoned in a Nürnberg tower.[31] Paul Glock passed the time of his nineteen-year imprisonment in careful Bible study.[32] A familiar statement of Menno Simons was "Our council (*Konzilium*) is the Scripture."

In the Hutterite catechism in the discussion of the Lord's Prayer we find in the margin no fewer than 131 Biblical references.[33] "Grant us, Lord, to live in Thy Word and to keep Thy covenant," is the prayer of an Anabaptist poet.[34] In a discussion with the Landmarshall in Vienna, the Anabaptists Max and Bernhard Klampferer read to him from the Bible.[35] Again and again Anabaptist prisoners made it clear that they would recant if they could be shown something better from the Scriptures.[36] What, may we ask, was the reason for the Anabaptist rejection of infant baptism? Was it the inner voice that compelled them? Most certainly not! It was, of course, because they found nothing about it in the Scriptures. Further, did the preachers, known as *Diener am Wort,* on their journeys tell the people about their supposed dreams and visions, or did they in the simplest way possible seek to impress the Word of salvation upon their hearts? Are not their letters, epistles, and confessions filled with quotations from both the Old and New Testaments, with chapter and verse?[37] In the writings of the shoemaker Preudler and in the *Rechenschaft* of Peter Riedemann verse after verse is quoted, connected by simple logic and explanation. Can there still be talk of a disparagement or even disregard for the written Word of God? Anyone who is at all acquainted with the writings of the Anabaptists will not employ his pen to such a purpose. Walter Köhler says correctly, "The Anabaptists wanted to be Bible Christians and they were on the whole precisely that."[38] Also L. von

[29] *Ibid.,* 692.
[30] Wiswedel, *op. cit.,* vol. I, 130f.
[31] *Ibid.,* 159.
[32] Bossert in *Blätter für Württemb. Kirchengeschichte,* 1929, 29.
[33] Cf. *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* vol. XXXVII, No. 1, 38ff.
[34] Wiswedel, *op. cit.,* II, 108.
[35] Joseph von Beck, *Geschichts-Bücher der Wiedertäufer* (Vienna, 1883), 263.
[36] Cf. e.g., Wiswedel, *op. cit.,* 89, 100, 104.
[37] Cf. *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* 1929, Nos. 1 and 2, 57f.
[38] Cf. *Mennonitische Geschichtsblätter,* 1940, 19.

Muralt writes: "Horsch shows that the Swiss Brethren held strictly to the Word of Scripture. The proofs found in the Horsch material, especially from the disputations between the Anabaptists and the clergy at Zofingen in 1532 and Bern in 1538 reveal this position. The Anabaptists stand on the platform of the Scripture (*Schriftprinzip*)."[39] Edward Becker also mentions their "extensive knowledge of the Bible."[40] Likewise Bossert, Jr.: "They are the quiet in the land; they take their direction from the Bible in continuous Bible study."[41] To be sure, some opponents of the Anabaptists, such as Fritz Heyer, asserted that the Anabaptists used the written Word in a rather legalistic way,[42] or even presume to declare: "The Anabaptists do indeed adapt themselves to the manner of argument of the Reformation period in their defensive writings, but this does not prove that all their assertions are the result of Bible study."[43] This is surely a peculiar kind of logic, especially in the absence of all attempts to prove or explain the charge.

Having examined the position of the Anabaptists with regard to the written and preached Word of God, let us now hear their testimonies regarding the "inner Word" or the "inner light." It must be said that in looking over the total Anabaptist literature, their confessions of faith, catechisms, *Rechenschaften,* letters, and the records of their cross-examinations, we find very little mention of the "inner light." The following names of preachers, missionaries, and leaders may be mentioned: Leonard Dax, the "bibelfeste Kämpfer," Griesinger, Leonhard Schiemer, Nikolaus Geyersbühler, Hans Kräl, Jeronimus Käls, Michael Seifensieder, Antoni Erfordter, Hans Oberecker, Andreas Ehrenpreis, Ambrosius and Hans Spittelmeier, Thomas van Imbroich, Matthias Servaes, Hans Arbeiter, Hans Schmidt or Raiffer, Julius Lober, Hans Nadler, Georg Nespitzer, Leonhard Dorfbrunner, Hans Leupold, the schoolmaster Würzburger, Georg Wagner, Hans Zuckenhammer, Veit Grünberger, Hans Schlaffer, Hans Amon, Hans Mandel, Hans Hut, Georg Zaunring, Wolfgang Vogel, the teacher Alexander of Thüringen, Melchior Rinck, Georg Blaurock, Michael Sattler, Philip Plener, Jakob Wiedemann, Joseph Hauser, and Menno Simons. The very fact that all of these leaders are rooted in the written Word of God and do not speak of an "inner Word"

[39] Cf. *Zwingliana,* new series, supplementary vol. I, No. 2, 123.

[40] *Geschichte und Altertumskunde,* new series, supplementary vol. I, No. 2, 123.

[41] *Blätter für Württemb. Kirchengeschichte,* new series, 1929, 8.

[42] E.g., Fritz Heyer. Cf. *Schriften des Vereins für Reformations-Geschichte,* vol. LVI, No. 2, 23.

[43] E.g., Lydia Müller, *op. cit.,* 27.

can save us from a hasty harsh judgment that would besmirch the entire Anabaptist movement.

But let us now hear what these Anabaptists said, who were somewhat influenced on this point by the ancient mystics whom they had read. One of these few was Hans Langenmantel who said, "Luther says, he preaches the Gospel of Christ, and with his physical voice he brings Christ into the hearts of his hearers. But I tell you, dear Luther, there must first be something within us that can accept the physical voice inwardly."[44] Ambrisius Spittelmayer declared before his judges—that it was not the intention of the Anabaptists to instigate revolt, but to learn and desire the divine Word that all men might be led to the truth . . . and to pray for them that they might be enlightened with the divine light. But Spittelmayer at once explained what he meant by divine light: not by visible visions, but by the Spirit of God Christ leads and teaches His church.[45] During the discussions with the Anabaptists imprisoned at Jena, when Melanchthon kept citing Scripture against them, Heinz Kraut declared that it was written in his heart as they had been taught by God. The devil could also write. Furthermore, Master Philip killed more people with his dead Scripture than all the hangmen.[46] Hans Höhne of Halberstadt said, in reply to the question as to where he had learned his heresy, that no human being had taught it to him, but the Father in heaven had written it with His little finger upon his heart; for He had said, "In the last days I will pour my spirit upon all people that they may be taught of God." This same spirit he had received from God.[47] The Anabaptist Umblaufft in Regensburg said the Scriptures and the outer Word are merely the witness and lamp of the inner Word of God. Therefore a man can be saved without preaching and Scriptures. Proof: otherwise illiterates could not be saved. We understand God, our Redeemer, not through the dead letter, but through the indwelling of Christ. Gal. 2:20. To the Scribes and Pharisees the written Word was not a guide to Christ, but a hindrance and punishment. Furthermore all who did not hear the Word and all who lived before the written Word was given, from Adam to Moses, would be lost. Salvation shall be ascribed alone to the inner living Word of God and not be bound to the outer Word, "however useful it may be if God reveals its meaning." The Bible is good for those who use it

[44] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, vol. II, 74f.
[45] *Ibid.*, 14.
[46] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, vol. I, 75f.
[47] *Ibid.*, 94.

aright, but its misuse is the source of all heresy and unbelief.[48] Another Anabaptist of Regensburg confessed that knowledge of the truth does not come from human study, . . . it comes only to those to whom it is given by grace through the light of His Spirit.[49] Michael Jungemann of Kürnbach in Württemberg considered the office of preaching a good Christian office if the Word is preached pure and unadulterated and if one lives accordingly. A preacher must be blameless. . . . Whatever God admonishes and enlightens him to do, he wants to follow in his life.[50] Michel Humel's widow, seventy years old, was "unteachable"—she declared briefly and finally that she was already adequately enlightened.[51] Likewise Margarete Fleckelin declared that she had been led to this doctrine by special illumination.[52] Melchior Greiner could not go to the Lord's table with open sinners, for Paul forbade the Corinthians to do so. He said that he did not disdain the divine order, but could not set a limit to God's illumination. He liked to hear preaching.[53]

Jakob Kautz, a former Lutheran preacher, said, "The Word that we speak outwardly with our mouth, hear with our physical ears, write and print with hands, is nothing living, nor the eternal Word of God, but only a witness or indication of the inner Word, so that the inner Word may be rightly understood. Nothing external, be it word, sign, sacrament, or promise, has power to reassure the inner man, comfort him, or make him certain."[54] Leopold Scharnschläger wrote in a letter: "Dear Brethren, you have repeatedly in your writing spoken of the word (letter). I think you have well understood the book of reply to Schwenckfeld's *Judicium,* chapter 4, answer 96, as this word was used against Schwenckfeld, and it is my opinion that the word 'letter' refers to the Old Testament (Rom. 2:29 and II Cor. 3:7) and not to the New, which brings with it the spirit and grace to make alive. Therefore it behooves us . . . not to call the Scriptures a dead letter as some do, because this Scripture calls itself the Holy Scripture, written by holy men of God and inspired by the Holy Spirit. As often as I hear or read it, it is the same as if I heard the Lord and His apostles speak. Furthermore, everyone knows that the letters with which the Scriptures were written are in themselves dead ink and paper, but in the true

[48] *Ibid.,* 94f.
[49] Hermann Nestler, *Die Wiedertäuferbewegung in Regensburg* (Regensburg, 1926), 33.
[50] Bossert, *op. cit.,* 531.
[51] *Ibid.,* 496.
[52] *Ibid.,* 382.
[53] *Ibid.,* 432.
[54] A. Weckerling, *Leonhard Brunner* (Worms, 1895), 15-17, Introduction.

understanding the Holy Scriptures are not dead ink and letters. If the Holy Scriptures in their meaning and understanding are not opened in the heart by the Holy Ghost, then not only the Holy Scriptures are dead, but Christ Himself with His teaching, His life, suffering, and death, yea even His resurrection are dead; they are of no use to a man to eternal life, even granted that he reads and studies as long as he likes. He could then be called learned in the Scripture, but not taught by the Spirit. In itself the Scriptures are the Word of God as it is learned, and therefore I should not call them a dead letter, but the Holy Scriptures, as they call themselves."[55] Ludwig Haetzer who with Denk translated the Prophets into German in 1527, remarked, "He who goes only by the Scriptures receives knowledge, but a useless knowledge, which does not reform, as happens to all who acquire faith by reading and by hearsay and make no other use of it than to say, I have read it in this or that chapter of the Scriptures. No man, no matter how learned he may be, can understand the Scriptures unless he has experienced and learned them in the depth of his soul. Otherwise men speak of the matter like a blind man of color."[56] In Marbeck's reply to Schwenckfeld's judgment of the *Book of the Covenant* of 1542 the author says that Schwenckfeld accused the Anabaptists of making two Words of God, one inner and one outer.[57] The Brethren refute this charge by saying, "We do not call ink and paper or the perishable part of the books of the Scripture God's Word, Spirit, and life, but we mean the meaning contained in what is composed, spoken, and written."[58] In such a case it is simply a matter of faith, without which God's preached or written Word does not reach the heart and cannot dwell therein to be spirit and life therein, as the Lord says, 'The words that I speak are spirit and life, but there are some among you who do not believe.' As if He wanted to say: they are spirit and life in man only through faith. And further, 'You do not have God's Word dwelling within you, for you do not believe Him whom God has sent.' They did not believe the witness that God had given in the law and the prophets before the Incarnation, reminding them again of that Scripture when He said, 'Ye search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me'; as all those think even today who have the written and preached Word of God not through faith in their

[55] *Zeitschrift des Vereins für die Geschichte Mährens und Schlesiens*, 1928, 11f.
[56] Karl Hagen, *Der Geist der Reformatoren und seine Gesetze*, II, 288.
[57] *Ibid.*, 518f.
[58] *Ibid.*, 521.

hearts for Life, but only outwardly in books.[59] There are not two, but only one word of God. What the Holy Scriptures call the Word of God is truly God's Word.[60] Whoever denies it makes the Scriptures a liar.[61] The outward preached or written Word of God helps no one if faith is not added by those who hear it.[62] The outward truth is a co-witness and the same truth as the inner truth in the believing heart. When a man hears the Word of God and believes it, in his heart the Holy Spirit makes it life. It is God's fixed ordinance, that he "saves and makes believers by means of external services."[63]

In the booklet, *Prozess, wie es soll gehalten werden mit den Wiedertäufern,* the brethren made an unambiguous reply to the charge that they put the center of gravity on inner illumination and taught that God could make Himself known without the outer Word. They began by saying that they had no pleasure in opposing such defamatory lies, but for the sake of the Word of God one must not neglect to refute them and to put to shame these hair-splitting, sly opponents of the truth. They did not at all believe that God reveals Himself without the hearing of the preached Word, for that would mean an annulment of an ordinance established by him. With Paul in I Thess. 2:13, they thanked God without ceasing for such a gift when they received the Word of divine preaching and accepted it not as the word of men but as the true Word of God which creates strong holy living in the believing. "For, dear Philip Melanchthon and Johannes Brenz, we are not ignorant that God could have given Saul the gift of the Holy Ghost and his vision without human means. But He did not want to interfere with His order, but Ananias had to be the means and the tool of God. Thus also God the Almighty could by His own strength and might, without Peter, have imparted divine understanding and divine life and caused him to understand the preaching and doctrine. But God did not do so, but Peter had to journey from Joppa to Caesarea and proclaim the Word of life to them, which they zealously heard, and received the Holy Spirit and believed the preached Word. Therefore Paul says, "Faith comes by preaching." Christ also said, "Go ye into all the world." The Brethren also referred to the voice from heaven at the baptism and transfiguration of Christ: "This is my

[59] *Ibid.,* 521f.
[60] *Ibid.,* 529.
[61] *Ibid.,* 530.
[62] *Ibid.,* 523.
[63] *Ibid.,* 149f.

beloved Son . . . hear ye him." And concerning His disciples the Lord said, "He who hears them hears me." But the outer Word that is preached to the people is the image and the instruction in the inner word, since the believer feels the grace and power of God in his heart and soul, which has been written there by the finger of the divine love of the Holy Spirit. And this is not that which is drawn upon paper or tables of stone as an imitation nor is it that which is heard outwardly, because it is not the hearers but the doers of works of piety of a heavenly life as the Scripture says, that are pleasing and acceptable to God.[64]

Further proof of the injustice of the accusation that the Anabaptists, especially the Hutterian Brethren, as Lydia Müller asserts, accorded the written Word of God a secondary place we find in the *Geschicht-Buch* of the Hutterian Brethren: the brother Benjamin Kempel at Sabatisch refused to recognize the service of preaching and daily prayer meetings. Asked to explain, he replied: The just need no teaching; the Holy Spirit is to instruct them, and common prayer is simply a human habit and not impelled by the Holy Spirit. All external customs, as baptism and communion are not necessary to the Christian. The office of preaching he did not consider divine. In brief: he believed that the Hutterian Brotherhood had never held the true position. . . . Since "he persisted proudly in his self-invented opinion," he was expelled from the brotherhood.[65] Peter Riedemann's *Rechenschaft* says unequivocally, "When the Word is heard and believed, then faith is sealed by the Holy Spirit." The Holy Spirit works upon the heart—"They were pricked in their hearts" (Acts 2)—but He does not yet dwell therein. Not until a man yields to the Word, opens his heart, and believes, does the Holy Spirit make His dwelling in the human heart. "Where the Spirit is not added to the Word, it cannot acquire the righteousness that is valid before God." But this (saving) faith comes from hearing the Gospel. Rom. 12:17. By zealous hearing and accepting of the preaching of the Gospel we become partakers of the fellowship of Christ. Through the Word God calls men to salvation and through it reveals Himself.[66]

Leonhard Schiemer said, "One is not yet a Christian when he can talk and sing of spiritual things: it must be written within and without us. In the book of the heavenly Revelation it stands written

[64] E.g., in Book VIII of the *Handbüchlein wider den Prozess, der zu Wurms am Rein wider de Brüder, so man die Hueterischen nennt, ausgangen ist* (1557). This Ms. of 107 pp. is now in the possession of the Hutterian Brethren in North America.

[65] Hagen, *op. cit.*, 630f.

[66] Riedemann, *Rechenschaft*, 34, 36, 56, 73.

that the book was written from without and within, and no one in heaven or on earth was worthy to read the book or to open it. But there was a lamb that had been slain, which opened it. Therefore saith the Lord, No one knows the Father but the Son and those to whom the Son reveals Him. If one comes to a knowledge of the truth it takes place not alone through hearing the Word of God outwardly, but he must also have the light of the Holy Spirit in his heart. For external learning is not sufficient except insofar as it is revealed inwardly in the heart."[67]

Hans Denk was one of those who stressed the inner word the most. The dark, difficult language peculiar to him has frequently been misunderstood and interpreted by his opponents to mean something that Denk did not mean at all. But Denk not only promoted the authority of the Holy Scriptures, but he also made abundant use of them. In his "recantation" he remarked: "The Holy Scriptures I hold above all treasures, but it is not as high as the Word of God which is living, powerful, and eternal; for if it is God himself, it is spirit and not letter written without pen and paper, that it may never be blotted out. Hence salvation is not bound to the Scriptures, however useful and good they may be to that end."[68] The Holy Scriptures are true and constant and reveal nothing but what God in truth wills. Blessed the man in whom the Word is true, as it is true in God and will remain in all eternity. The voice that preaches in the hearts of all men and proclaims the Word of God has from eternity been immortal spirit, which from times immemorable has communicated the will of God and has become man in Christ. The Word of God, the spirit of Christ, who was from eternity, is with you before you know the historical Christ and the Holy Scriptures. This "inner Word" then intermediates the possibility of understanding the outer Word and brings it about that we are led to the knowledge of the truth, but as we do not have that inner Word of ourselves but from God, so the honor and merit belongs to Him.[69] The light, the Word of God that is invisible, shines in the hearts of all men who come into this world, for it has been within from the beginning.[70]

There are two factors that lead to faith; first the Holy Scriptures which show the way as a lamp at night. Then also the Morning star, which proclaims the Sun of Righteousness, i.e., Christ,

[67] Brünn, *op. cit.*, No. 45, 26-43.
[68] *Was da geredet sei, dass die Schrift sagt, Gott tue Gutes und macht Böses.*
[69] *Ordnung Gottes und der Kreaturen Werk,* Paragraph I.
[70] *Protestation und Bekenntnis,* chapter III.

the inner Word, the voice of the Holy Spirit which is destined to rise and thrive.

He who is not in a right relationship with God, who is not permeated by His Spirit nor filled with His love, cannot understand the Scriptures, but "makes of it an idol." The inner voice is the foundation of faith. Faith means to obey the Word of God, be it for life or death. Denk calls attention to Abraham, who of course did not possess the written Word of God and yet saw the day of Christ and rejoiced. "As I now progress at the hand of the inner and outer Word, I reach the understanding that the inner voice in me is a spark of the divine spirit. But this divine spark is darkened in many hearts. Only he can understand the Scriptures correctly who is himself illuminated by the light of the divine Spirit. Therefore let no one venture to interpret the Scriptures for himself or others before he knows that his will is in harmony with the voice in his heart which commands him to do good and abstain from evil. John 7:17. You say that anyone can understand the Scriptures who knows the language and the history to which it refers, and believes that human understanding and reason has the right to explain and exegete it. No, worldly wisdom does not suffice, but what Peter says is true: exposition is the right of the Holy Spirit, i.e., the Spirit that has given it."[71] "He who does not regard God's revelations in his breast but presumes to explain the Holy Scriptures, which is really the right of the Spirit alone, he will surely make an abomination of the divine secrets written in the Holy Scriptures, and abuses the grace given to him."[72] These are probably the most important of Denck's ideas along this line.

Besides Denk it was Stadler who dealt with this question in three booklets. In his treatise, *Ein Eingang ins Christentum,*[73] we read the following sentences: In the Gospel, the written Word, repentance from dead works is proclaimed to all people, for the Word of the Lord says: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Preachers must rightly present and divide Christ and His Word: the Gospel of Christ, cause and reason for His incarnation, life, teaching, His death and resurrection, ascension, His kingdom and coming judgment, of His church, etc. Him who is upright God enlightens and draws him inwardly and says, "O man, what is impossible with you is possible with me; I will give to you and deal with you if you believe, as my Word says, and willingly yield and trust

[71] In his book, *Vom Gesetz Gottes.*
[72] In his confession of 1525.
[73] Brünn, *op. cit.,* No. 50, 5-8.

Me, . . . then it will be made easy for you out of mercy. When one believes divine preaching from his heart, is obedient to the truth, and denies the world and its deeds, and submits to Christ and in voluntary submission (*Gelassenheit*) endures all, then man becomes a temple of God . . . and if he is found faithful unto death, then with those who have washed their garments in the blood of the Lamb, he will receive the crown of life." Stadler expresses similar ideas in the epistle he wrote at Ladomir in Podolia to the brethren in Krasnikow.[74]

Stadler deals at length with the matter in a special booklet entitled *Vom lebendigen und geschriebenen Wort oder von dem äusserlichen und innerlichen Wort und ihrer Wirkung im Herzen. Unterschied und Bericht.*[75] He says that all creation and all creatures including the Holy Scriptures and the spoken and proclaimed Word are good, but they are not the living Word. He who would use the Scriptures properly must not base it on anything human, but he must also distinguish it from the inner Word of the heart. The outer Word is the Word which Christ commanded His apostles when He said, preach the Gospel to every creature. Here preaching, believing, and baptism are all understood and treated purely externally, though they are only symbols of the living Word, faith, and baptism, which God alone works through His righteousness. Thus Paul also says, Faith comes from hearing the preaching, but hearing from the Word of God. A true preacher must accept the true Word of God in the depth of his soul: then it becomes the true Word of God in the depth of his soul. But that which is preached is only the witness or symbol of the true Word. The inner word is not written, neither upon paper nor upon tables, it is not spoken or preached; man is assured by it through God in the depth of his soul and it becomes engraved in a heart of flesh through the Spirit by the finger of God. The inner word is witnessed by the outer, as the sign before an inn witnesses the wine in the keg, but the sign is not the wine; thus it is also with the divine order, that always the physical precedes the spiritual: the faith of hearing comes before justification, after which the tested faith grows and works powerfully toward God and all creation. But this does not happen as quickly as the scribes of our day say, who persuade the poor people by saying, "Believe, believe!" Yea, this will soon become evident. Then they say: with God all things are possible. This is indeed true,

[74] *Ibid.*, 47.
[75] *Ibid.*, 10-12, 17-21.

but He does not act thus, but orders all things according to design according to His omnipotence and mercy.

Stadler then supports his argument with Biblical examples. Abraham heard God's Word and believed and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. The outer Word worked in him and was sufficient for him even to justification. But when the test of his faith came, this faith was lost in unbelief and he denied his wife before Pharaoh. Thus it was also with Jacob. God had promised him: I will guard thee, whither thou goest, and will not forsake thee until I have accomplished that which I have promised. But when Jacob heard that his brother Esau was coming toward him with an army, the Word of promise and his faith were completely hidden by unbelief. He fell down before his brother and begged for mercy. Where were his faith and the Word? Nor was it any different with David. Upon the promise of God he had been anointed king over Israel and he believed. But when he was sought by Saul with one thousand men and was surrounded he thought God had forsaken him and was unable to believe the Word. Oh, how a man suffers before his faith becomes separated from his unbelief in justification and in trial. "However high the man's faith in the beginning, Word and faith completely disappear before he becomes aware of the goodness and mercy of God. The seed of grain must die in every man before it can bear fruit. Man must first be justified and crushed. It does him no good to know how Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and all the friends of God fared; indeed, even if he knew the entire Bible, this is merely lip service, of no benefit to himself or to others. If the Word that he hears, believes, and perceives is not justified and tested, it will be called only a sign, witness, or letter of the living Word." The image of a man is not the man. Thus the printed Word is only an image or sign of the living Word. The preachers often deceive the poor people by pointing to the sign which one hears or preaches or reads in books. They persuade the people that it is God's Word and the people remain unsaved and the teaching is not followed by reformation of life. This one sees with his eyes.

Stadler continues that according to the divine plan the inner Word follows the outer, and the preacher shall admonish through the outer Word that man should yield himself to God and listen to the inner instructor. One must not make the people depend on the outer Word, or one makes an idol of the preacher, the Scriptures and words. They are merely an image or sign or tools. It does no good and is not sufficient to confess that Christ became flesh in

Mary; Christ must also become flesh in us, in the Word and through the Spirit, as Paul writes in Gal. 2: "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." And again, "The world is crucified to me and I to the world." Thus whoever confesses Christ may boast of the living Word, he can properly testify of the truth; such preachers we want to expect from God.

The Old Testament, as it is written according to the letter, is in this point, according to Stadler, not to be distinguished from the New, for it is preached in parable by preachers like the New. For because it remains a witness, is heard, read, and preached, it is all called the Old Testament, law, command, or Word, be it Moses or the prophets, the evangelists, or the apostles, Paul or John, as John also says: I do not write you a new commandment, but an old, which ye have had from the beginning. The new commandment is all we live by, implanted in our heart through the Holy Spirit: it is the new commandment or living Word of God, if it lives within us, rules us, and regenerates us from sin according to the will of God as He desires of us human beings in Christ Jesus.[76]

From all of these foregoing testimonies we draw the following conclusions: (1) From all the writings of the Anabaptists it is clear that they did not deny all historical objective means of salvation and expect everything from the "inner light" and the working of the Spirit of God. Stadler also admits the Old Testament as well as the New. Unambiguous are his words. "The inner Word is, according to the divine order, preceded by the outer Word, and the preacher shall admonish from the outer Word." (2) But they believed that the objective and traditional written Word must be supplemented by the working of the Holy Spirit upon the subject. They did not separate the inner Word from the outer. Word and spirit, or "inner light" belong together; they form a unit, but in the manner in which the two threads are twined together to form cord, as water and baptism. Word without spirit was to them a dead letter. The life-giving Spirit of God turns the written and proclaimed Word into God's Word. The Word is the sword of the Spirit; both belong together. This was well stated by Wolfgang Vogel, a former clergyman of Eltersdorf, as follows: "The Spirit clings and hangs alone to the noble, pure, tender, and holy Word of God through a strong and firm faith." In Marbeck's book we read, "The outwardly preached or written Word is, according to the sense, one with the inner Word,

[76] These are in part odd ideas, but certainly not at all such as have been allegedly found in this work by Stadler. For this reason it has been thought necessary to let the author speak at some length. It is evident that Stadler has merely borrowed his figures of speech from the mystical books.

as one word of many words, and ministers as one and agrees as a unit." The idea of the inner Word is thus meant in the sense of an inner inspiration, but as an illuminating co-working of God. This inner Word or Spirit sharpens the inner spiritual eye and gives it a true comprehension of the truth revealed in the written Word.

(3) The Anabaptists did not believe that the useful preacher of the Word was one who knew how to present the "true doctrine," and that the written Word became effective in and of itself, though it be proclaimed from the mouth of an unbeliever. They could correctly point out that no one surpassed the Pharisees in knowledge of the Scriptures as far as the outer letter is concerned and yet they were far removed from the true knowledge of God and of Christ. "There are scribes," said Ascherham, "who are sent without the Holy Spirit, only by the Scriptures; from it they take their wisdom and strength. They, having received the 'letter-spirit,' proceed to make a profession out of it, and thus they have only the dead letter to give the people."[77] Thus Stadler also said, "We need preachers who have experienced the written Word as a vital force and are illuminated by the Spirit of God."[78] A preacher, they thought, must be a God-fearing man; it is not the ecclesiastical ordination but the inner call and equipment through the Holy Spirit that make the preacher. The Spirit that creates the Word also makes it effective —not the presentation of the "pure doctrine." Denk, whose religious life was rooted in the soil of the Middle Ages, repeatedly cited II Cor. 3:6, where the apostle warned against worshiping the letter, countering such adoration with the fact that the letter of the Holy Scriptures becomes a living and life-creating Word only through the Spirit of God. To be sure, it cannot be denied that Denk, Kautz, and also Stadler inclined toward a strong spiritualization. But they did not succumb to the dangers of pantheism. Since life posed practical problems to them, they were saved from this danger. This was also clearly pointed out by Walter Köhler, when he remarked, "Denk allowed himself to be deeply influenced by mysticism, especially by the *Deutsche Theologie*: but in him speculation has been reshaped into Biblicism under the influence of Luther's ideas."[79] This is seen in the fact that Denk speaks so much of discipleship of Christ, this being impossible of achievement without the

[77] See Wiswedel's article on Ascherham in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* 1937. Nos. 1 and 2, p. 12.

[78] Luther is supposedly the source of the very fitting statement, "Even the purest spring water loses flavor and clearness when it flows through unclean pipes." This is what the Anabaptists meant.

[79] Cf. *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* I, col. 2035.

Holy Scriptures, since without the Gospel one does not know wherein such discipleship consists. But the prerequisite of discipleship is for Denk the freedom of the will and divine light in the human soul.

Besides Denk there is also Jakob Kautz who uses strong words respecting the "inner light." "The word which we speak outwardly with the mouth, hear with physical ears, write and print with physical hands, is not the living, true, and everlasting Word of God, but only a symbol or witness of the inner Word, so that the right thing may be done outwardly. Nothing external, be it word or sign, sacrament or promise, has the power of assuring, comforting, or convincing the inner man." But it cannot be said that Kautz rejected the outer Word; consider his words, "that the right may be done outwardly."[80]

The case is this: the Anabaptists, seeing that the new preachers were giving disproportionate emphasis to the written Word of God and that the masses by their consent to the printed and proclaimed Word had not become new creatures, on their part then stressed the "inner Word," occasionally disproportionately too, but not to the extent that they removed the Spirit from the written and preached Word; otherwise they would, of course, not have everywhere appointed and chosen preachers of the Word (*Diener des Worts*).

(4) The Anabaptists drew a sharp line between Biblical faith, which, as the writers influenced by mysticism expressed themselves, is accomplished in the "depth of the soul" by the Holy Spirit and what was commonly called faith. Thus Stadler said, It does not suffice to confess: I believe the written Word and consider it God's Word. Such faith does not save and is not followed by improvement of conduct. Biblical faith is a work of grace of the Holy Spirit who brings to life the read or heard Word, so that it becomes a power in man to live righteously and to suffer patiently. Indeed, suffering becomes for those who believe from the heart a means of strengthening faith, but not "the means by which a man comes into possession of the Spirit or of the inner Word," as Lydia Müller believes can be concluded from certain sentences taken out of context.

(5) That there was occasionally evidence of unwholesome concomitants of the "inner illumination" cannot be denied. It did indeed occur that the supposed voice of the Spirit was simply the brain. But does that not still happen among the Christians of today? But this phenomenon does not necessarily discredit the valuable content of the insight gained by the idea. Harnack, for instance, says in his

[80] Cf. *Sieben Artikel zu Worms von Jakob Kautzen angeschlagen und gepredigt*, 1527. (A Weckerling, *Leonhard Brunner*, Worms, 1895, 15-17.)

Dogmengeschichte: The inner Word of the "fanatics" should not be turned into a bogey that must allegedly fall into the dust under the sword of Biblicism ("*Schriftprinzip*"); for as certainly as some true fanaticism was nourished on the "inner word," it has nonetheless also been the expression of a religious liberty which Luther himself at one time indeed recognized, but the right of whose existence he never expressed so clearly as to create of it a dogmatic statement that would limit the *Schriftprinzip*.[81]

Von Muralt also honors historical truth in replying to Bullinger's assertion that in the entire Anabaptist movement, which was clearly connected with Müntzer, the immediate possession of the Spirit outweighed Biblicism, when he writes, "Certainly at times they claim the immediate possession of the Spirit . . . on the basis of I Cor. 2:14. In doing so they merely mean to point to the understanding of the Scriptures given by God's Spirit."[82] That is indeed the case!

(6) Yes, the Anabaptists, believed also in the immediate work of the Spirit of God. God can speak directly to the soul. "The world," said a simple Anabaptist once, "existed for 2453 years without a Bible, but the God-fearing had God's Word" (Ps. 25:14; Gen. 25:22). The Bible is not the only revelation of God. If God works only through the outer Word, we will have to deny the possibility of miracles. The Anabaptists had Biblical proof for this. One thing is, of course, correct: all other revelations of God to man must be proved by the Holy Scriptures. They are in a sense the absolute measure that can alone be normative. That which does not agree with them cannot be God's Word.

(7) The idea of the "inner Word" recurs later in history in other movements as well. George Fox introduced his powerful movement with the watchword, "Upon the Spirit, upon the inner Word everything depends," explaining that the entire Bible must be personally comprehended and experienced in the innermost depth of the soul. Only by inward experience do we become strong for the severest conflict. "You are strong, and the Word of God remains with you and you have overcome the Evil One."

Gottfried Arnold in his history of the church and heretics quotes a rhyme by Anna Orvena Hayer, of a noble family of Holstein:

Aber Gottes Wort, Jesus Christ,
Ist Geist und Leben, redt inwendig,

[81] *Ibid.*, III, 773.
[82] *Zwingliana*, 1934, No. 2, 69f.

Machet allein das Herz verständig,
Aendert der Menschen Sinn und Mut,
Reicht weiter, denn der Buchstab tut,
Das äusser nur die Ohren rühret,
Das inner wort zum Geist einführet,
Bringt mit ihm Lebenskraft und Saft,
Ohn dies das äusser wenig schafft;
Drum soll man nach dem innern trachten,
Das äusser aber nicht verachten.[83]

Tersteegen also honored the "inner Word," as in this little verse of his:

Von Kreatur, Vernunft und Sinne abgeschieden,
Im edlen Seelengrund macht sich die Gottheit meinem Geiste kund.

And even the world-renowned C. H. Spurgeon is close to these people. When his tabernacle congregation was celebrating its fiftieth anniversary he said, "Whenever I have read a chapter in the church, I have prayed that the Holy Spirit may disclose to you the meaning of the words of Scripture. I hope that I have never preached without relying completely on the Holy Spirit."

Indeed, by all the representatives of the ecclesiastical and extra-ecclesiastical *Gemeinschaftsbewegung* the immediate working of the Holy Spirit is assumed and taught. This concept is characterized as "enthusiasm" and "fanaticism" by Pastor Fleisch. We, however, believe that we have in these citations brought proof that all of the men discussed in this paper from the depths of their being agree with the confession of two church hymn writers:

Mir ists nicht um tausend Welten,
Aber um Dein Wort zu tun;
and
Sein Geist spricht meinem Geiste
Manch süsses Trostwort zu.

[83] *Die moderne Gemeinschaftsbewegung in Deutschland*, 121.

THE WISDOM OF CHRIST AND THE CULTURE OF MAN

The Theology of War and Its Cultural Relationships

DON. E. SMUCKER

Recently two major nonpacifist documents have been published: *The Christian Conscience and Weapons of Mass Destruction,* the report of a special commission of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; and a report by a commission of the Church of Scotland with a somewhat broader assignment.

The so-called Dun commission restates the doctrine of military necessity and the Scotch document restates the doctrine of the just war. Neither is hackneyed nor without some fresh approaches to the problem. Yet basically both re-echo ancient positions. Necessity is quite primitive; the just war is quite legalistic. Yet both seem to revolve about the basic assumption that war is essentially a weapon against tyranny—crude, ugly, and repulsive, but yet the only thing available in a terrible dilemma between evils.

In the midst of a consideration of these and other documents I was struck by a most amazing fact: *crisis theology has forced the discussion of war into theological categories which tend to assume that war is an imperfect but essentially neutral instrument which can be used for given political ends invested with intense ethical value.*

The major issue here is the picture of a nation which can pick up war as an instrument of politics. It assumes the moral neutrality of war as a system, it assumes that the nation is free to yoke this neutral *means* to a wide variety of *ends* relatively good or bad but, of course, preferably good. In other words, the crisis theologians have emptied war, as such, of moral meaning and have given political objectives of the nation in war supreme moral meaning. Or, to put it somewhat differently, the issue between war or nonparticipation in war is relativized while the degrees of difference in the political objectives of one warring nation versus another warring nation are absolutized.

At the moment the theological discussion has reached an impasse. The nonpacifist theologians, orthodox, neo-orthodox, fundamentalist, Roman and Eastern Orthodox have gone about as far as they can in clarifying and publicizing their positions. By the same token, the rejoinders of the Christian pacifists and nonresistants have dealt with the basic issues to the point where not much further remains to be said—although as a minority in the church the Chris-

tian pacifists have failed to receive serious consideration from many in the larger nonpacifist majority. The foregoing comments do not mean to imply that nothing new can be said theologically in regard to war, but primarily that both pacifists and nonpacifists in the church seem mutually unable to introduce something which creates a basic change in the debate between them.

In the light of the above perhaps there may be justification in introducing a *cultural* dimension into the discussion. The fundamental category of social science is culture. In the Bible this is "the world." That is, the total complex of ideas, behavior patterns, and values which together constitute the life of man in given groups throughout the world.

What light does this shed on the picture of the relatively better nation picking up the relatively neutral means of war to stem the tide of tyranny? What light upon the picture of war as a sword which is unsheathed when needed for an instrumental task and then sheathed once again? (Chancellor Kimpton of Chicago used this figure in referring to the university as the sword of culture in wartime and the sheath of culture in peacetime.) I think that a cultural and historical study of war sheds great light on this *moralistic-secular* view of war: moralistic ends and secular means. In this brief survey we shall look at various approaches, highly varied, but uniting in challenging this view of war as something which is willfully and rationally controllable, morally and ethically neutral, culturally and sociologically something set apart.

1. *War is rooted in the totality of culture.* This is the view of the late Willard Waller in his book, *War in the Twentieth Century.* Waller was a highly respected sociologist with appointments in several leading universities. War in our culture is not accidental, occasional, peripheral or a mere by-product. War is the total culture in the aggressive phase of its expression. *In a sense war is the culture and the culture is war.*

A few quotations from Waller will point up his view of this matter: War is total since ". . . every institution, every ingrained morality is likely to be in some way a cause of war. . . . The culture complex of war ramifies in such a way throughout the whole of culture that it would be virtually impossible to rear a child to maturity without inculcating the attitude of the potential soldier."

Or again, Waller notes: "Nobody effectively wills that we shall go to war and perhaps nearly everyone ardently desires that we shall not, but everyone does his part in bringing war about." In trying to characterize our age men have suggested that it is the machine age,

the scientific age, the humanitarian, the sensate. Waller declares, "It would be more justifiable to say that it is the age of war. European civilization in the 20th century has to date always been getting ready for a war, fighting a war, or recovering from a war."

Now Prof. Waller is not the first person to take this position, nor is it a position beyond criticism or without real dangers. Obviously, history's most ardent militarists have divided mankind into two groups: those helping you to make war and those against whom you wage war. In crude fashion they have seen human culture as a mad militaristic melee or *milieu*. The definitive militarist not only argues that culture *is* this way but that it *must* be this way. Hence, by choice and necessity the culture revolves around the cult of war. To recognize the role of power in politics is not to bless the inevitability of militarism. What is more important, to recognize Waller's point is not to join Mussolini or Theodore Roosevelt or Ruskin on war as societal tonic or as highest cultic ritual.

The real heart of this insight for us in the Commission on the Christian Conscience and War is that war is not a tool on the shelf of culture, but rather that war is inextricably bound up with the culture. War is in the cornerstone of culture, the foundation, the frame, the floor, the roof, and the siding. It suggests that our war culture picks us from the shelf of the culture and uses us rather than the other picture. Surely it gives us a picture of some monstrous dimension of the total culture using individuals as tools within a context determined by forces beyond these individuals. Yet in view of the reality of human freedom, the power of nonconformist minorities, the conception of the Christian church as a remnant, called-out minority, this view cannot deny the possibility of defying the tremendous power of a war culture. What Barth calls the three-dimensional view of history—the Cross, the Resurrection, the Holy Spirit, the Koinonia—enters here to offer mighty resources against the otherwise terrifying power of the culture in war-making.

And the insight of war as imbedded in the totality of culture ominously qualifies, on the other hand, the amiable optimism which sees moral issues in the relative ends of competing nations and then hopes to apply the war system to these objectives with surgical skill. It almost appears as though one is in fact offered the simple alternative of co-operating with a Frankenstein monster or opposing it—this as over against the prevailing optimistic view that Frankenstein has been to the mental hospital of democracy and is cured of his genocidal tendencies; and that now Frankenstein will obey the or-

ders of democracy. He is not a maniac who will destroy us but a slave who will serve us.

Finally, this insight suggests the urgency of a Christian pacifist eschatology. If war is inextricably bound up with the culture, if war and culture are virtually synonymous, then the total deliverance from this is a stupendous event, radical, far-reaching and revolutionary. It calls for resources now available for personal and *koinonia* defiance of war. But more than that it calls for resources in the power of the Living God beyond history for a radical completion of God's purpose as Rachel H. King showed in the excellent Fellowship publication, *God's Boycott of Sin, A Study of Hell and Pacifism*. In any case, the fundamental issue of man *qua* man demands forthright action of the most radical character. The kingdom did come with Christ as the Baptist proclaimed. But the kingdom is yet to come in view of our rotten, utterly militarized culture. The Christ of agape-love who is Lord cannot permanently leave that rebellious culture in its secular apocalyptic climaxes of war. A warlike culture, by definition, must go, sooner or later.

The culture-of-war and war-of-culture are nearing some kind of climax, according to Sorokin. War is one of the most constant and distinctive features of human history—it is nothing new. But the Harvard sociologist argues that the twentieth century is the bloodiest century of all history and that this violence is all-pervasive, reaching peaks in revolution, suicide, crime, punishment, and war. Clearly, then, the issue between the kingdom of God (as the kingdom of love) and the kingdoms of culture is acutely real and deep. To yoke this culture to the relative objectives of sovereign nations or semi-sovereign world organizations seems only to intensify the real issue of Christ as Lord and all the idolatrous pretensions of human culture.

2. *A second view is that war is an intricate cultural order influencing and being influenced by other cultural orders.* This is the view of Kimball Young and perhaps a fairly large majority of sociologists. The Waller position demands a more radical, deep and broad analysis of war in our culture. The Kimball Young position sees war as a semiautonomous cultural order within the larger culture, interacting with all other segments of the culture.

Granted that war is persistent through all history, granted that it is tough and resilient as a characteristic of culture, the particular kind of army reflects the social and cultural conditions of time and place. The industrial revolution, for example, did not bring war; nor did war bring the industrial revolution, as Prof. Nef has

shown in his *War and Human Progress*. Yet the industrial revolution has reached the cultural order of war to leave its obvious effect.

The most exhaustive study of our war-making military culture is the four volume, *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II*, by S. A. Stouffer, C. I. Howland, et al., published by Princeton, 1949. Space does not permit any basic consideration of this monumental study. Yet smaller studies have been made for some time of our military caste. For example, *The American Journal of Sociology*, March 1946, has a number of significant essays, especially the one titled, "The Social Structure of the Army." Let us consider some of this material in order to see the army as the concentration of our war-making cultural order and its interaction with other social institutions.

The paper is prefaced by the following significant remark on theory and practice: "In any social organization there is a theoretical structure consisting of formal rules and regulations designed to control the activities of members. The former consists of verbal precepts that indicate how things are supposed to be done while the latter consists of overt activities that indicate how things are actually done. There may be considerable discrepancy between the two. Such a discrepancy in complex societies provides a convenient opportunity to profit by protecting sub-rosa activities that conflict with the theoretical structure. . . . The conflict between precept and practice encourages a peculiar type of chameleon-like versatility among persons whose status requires that the conflict be perpetuated."

This quotation prepares us for a realistic analysis of our military caste which is actually determined by three traditions:

(*a*) the modern American tradition of business efficiency, self-interest, individualism, democracy and equalitarianism.

(*b*) the medieval tradition of rigid separation of castes, of hierarchical control, of the absence of moral accountability for the upper social strata, of regarding the privileges of the lower strata as a matter of the whim of the upper strata; and

(*c*) the changing body of military doctrine that goes into the formal body of rules known as army regulations.

Upon the above trilogy of influences, the author remarks: "While the army regulations . . . theoretically govern the army, the basic structure is set by the medieval tradition. As far as social organization is concerned Army regulations serve only to bring awareness to military leaders of the existence of the modern American tradition."

Whatever we may think of this particular analysis there is no doubt that the military forces operate as caste with theoretical and *de facto* foundations which must be considered in any use of war for exalted ethicopolitical ends. The clearest fact here is that the military caste is not some neutral and static social unit. The military caste as a cultural order is at once amazingly similar, from the Red Army to the American army, yet quite reflective of the particular cultural order in which it is operating.

Consider further the fact that the military caste has a rather amazing similarity the world over. For one thing there is the lust for ever more power and privilege which the military exerts. Christian pacifists and antimilitarists generally have called attention to the military caste with its vast funds, larger personnel, impact in civilian branches of government, a large publicity-propaganda department, plans for control of labor and industry and large influence in public and higher education. More recently this was documented in the booklets, *The Militarization of America* and *New Evidence for the Militarization of America.*

In the figure of war as a tool on the shelf of culture we once again see a dynamic cultural order seeking to win others to its influence, control, ideology, and outreach. The lust for power seems limited only by the amount of restraint placed upon the military caste rather than convictions against unlimited power. With crisis theology making power central in its political analysis—and power as an expression of tragic necessity—too little has been made of the power which the war system represents; a cluster of power jealous of its own prerogatives in relation to all other human orders.

Moreover, this cultural order of war and war-making has had a considerable historical development. Always there is interaction between the military caste and the cultural orders to which it is related. Objectives first were warlike forays aimed at seizure of wealth, wars resulting in displacement of population, wars of extermination (5000 years before modern totalitarianism and modern tyranny), wars for tribute without resettlement or immigration and the holy wars of the Crusaders, wars for independence, and with the coming of the French Revolution wars between peoples, between nations-in-arms.

There have been evolutionary changes in weapons. The War Wound Museum near the Smithsonian Institute in Washington shows the different injuries inflicted by the weapons which parallel American history—the tomahawk and the crushed skull, the World War I shrapnel and the disfigured face and so on. Now it is the

atomic bomb which kills three ways: crushing, burning, and destroying blood cells. The bayonet, according to Prof. Nef, was first invented for hunters. At first there was resistance to the use of the bayonet because it was considered too messy.

The atomic bomb comes as a climax to a long development of weapons. The Dun Commission was right in seeing that there is no intrinsic difference between one weapon and another weapon. The social destructiveness of war is not greatly affected by weapons. Hoffman Nickerson in his *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1946, Chicago) article on war points out that two unarmed groups could kill each other off to the last man if they chose. The bomb only poses the issue in dramatic terms, in staggering terms. Study of the U.S. Navy book, *Hand to Hand Combat* (Annapolis, 1943) reveals literally scores of ways to kill a man without the use of any weapon but the hands and legs.

In the attempts to assess the relationship of war to other cultural orders one of the major developments of our time has been the refutation of the belief that socialist societies would cause the war system to vanish. This general socialist position tended to see the cultural order of war in bondage to the economic system. Liberal thought reinforced this position. And, indeed, the position contained some very basic insight. As Waller so brilliantly put it, "The economic interpretation of war fits many of the facts of some wars and it fits some of the facts of nearly all wars." But we may add it does not fit all of the facts of all wars since war clearly persists in complex societies and simple societies, capitalist societies and socialist societies, extravagant societies and poverty-stricken societies. Hence, another attempt to see the war system as subservient to lesser cultural orders has failed to prove its case even though it has left the permanently valuable legacy of the importance of the economic. And surely the influence of the economic upon the military. And quite clearly the lush economic prizes which go to those who serve the military order through industrial or leadership capacities.

The world government supporters, both the sound and the fanatical ones, have suggested the primacy of the political order in relation to the cultural order of the military. The war-making powers of sovereign nations are singled out as the most fundamental factor in perpetuating war. There is much plausibility here as we see the difference between sheer chaos and orderly government under law. Yet we note again that war persists through every kind of political arrangement we have known thus far. It has persisted through the kings of the Oriental empires, the democracy of the

Greek cities, the oligarchy of Sparta, the tyrants of Asia Minor and Greece, the Senate and emperors of Rome, the suzerain, vassals, and monarchs of the Middle Ages, the parliaments and congresses of democracy with the newly delegated powers to the departments of state and war and the power of private wealth. The utter failure of the United Nations to check the drift to war only underscores the point. Unless some major cultural change takes place it must be assumed that a superstate, minus sovereignty, would have war recurring as civil war. The war system is a cultural order ever influenced by the political order and albeit ever willing to serve whatever political order may come, yet defying any political order to destroy it. Thus it would seem that war as a system tends to influence more than be influenced.

A final factor in connection with war as a cultural order is that it is extremely difficult to control and predict its consequences. In 1919 Prof. H. A. L. Fischer of Oxford wrote a famous essay called, "The Art of Guessing in Politics," recently reprinted in the Morgenthau and Thompson readings on international relations. No one saw the rise and fall of Greece, the rise and fall of Rome, the falling away of the American colonies from England; neither Franklin nor Frederick the Great predicted the French Revolution; few foresaw modern democracy with its vices or virtues. Prof. Fischer shows how difficult it is to predict how the nations would line up in various wars. One might add how difficult it still is to predict the direction of world affairs in the context of destructive warfare and explosive social forces. The Oct. 27, 1951, issues of *Colliers* magazine dealing with a possible third world war between Russia and the United States assumes that (*a*) America will defeat Russia; (*b*) Russia will change overnight to democratic culture; (*c*) the rest of the world not mentioned (China, India, Africa) will cooperate in this Brave New World; (*d*) war is a controllable instrument available for given ends, no less and no more. One of my students suggested that *Colliers* do another issue for 1975: *The War We Didn't Plan On.*

From this vantage point, then, war is a cultural order, dynamic, explosive, and unpredictable. Throughout history few have seen the most important events of history as operating through a maze of war and cultural conflict. Once again the picture of war as a tool to be taken from the shelf and then returned is much too static and neutral.

By way of over-all summary on the second point, war is an intricate cultural order influencing and being influenced by other

cultural orders. While reflecting some impact from American culture the military caste still reflects the medieval tradition of rigid separation of castes, of hierarchical control, of the absence of moral accountability for the upper social strata and of regarding the privileges of the lower strata as a matter of whim. It is a dynamic cultural order lusting for more power and possessing powerful propaganda weapons to extend that power. The war-making activities have had considerable development, with the nation-in-arms the unique modern development. Weapons do not differ intrinsically even though the atomic bomb poses the issue in staggering terms. The economic control of war-making seems overemphasized though real and the same goes for the political. Finally, war is politically quite unpredictable.

All this indicates that grave questions arise over the attempt of the nonpacifist Christian community to lend its support to war. A loosely organized Christian community is using a caste with centuries of overlaid creed and practice essentially supranational. A caste which has defied attempts of the economic and political forces to conquer it and has survived every kind of culture. A caste which has defied the predictive powers of science. If the nonpacifist Christian community is going to pick this tool off the shelf, it is embracing one of the most sovereignly successful cultures of all history. A culture with continuity, resiliency and explosive power. Such a cultural analysis helps our theological discussion where responsible use of power has become one of the major affirmations. Can the power of war be used with responsibility—which is to say, a conscious, willful, definitive, honest, controllable decision? It appears that war will not yield to this quest.

On the other hand, the Christian prophet can defy the culture of war and break its power at one simple point, the point of explicit participation and support. Through the grace of God, through the power and example of Christ, through the Holy Spirit, the resurrection, the *koinonia,* the eschatological hope, the Christian and the Christian community can defy the war culture. But, alas, those who *embrace* the war culture will find a cruel adversary, ominous, malevolent, and threatening—indeed, an adversary jealous of all lesser loyalties and purposes; an adversary seeking to smash all competing allegiances.

3. *The third approach from the cultural dimension is that which regards war as social disorganization in its most disruptive form, i.e., war as a disruptive influence on the culture.* This is the view of Elliott and Merrill in *Social Disorganization,* for many

years one of the finest texts in social pathology. It is also the view of Sorokin even though he has a special vocabulary to describe these disorganizing effects.

Elliott and Merrill consider war as the final stage in the process of world disorganization, of which fascism and revolution are preliminary stages. War shifts disorganization to the entire national population. Hence, war as global disorganization trickles down into the smaller aspects of any given culture. There is the personal demoralization of the soldier, the personal demoralization of the civilian population, the social dislocation of war, the dysgenic effect of war and the pathological effect of war on social institutions.

Note, then, the impact of this position. The culture breaks down through disintegrating and disorganizing tendencies. The disorganizing breakdown of the culture comes from the failure of old social institutions to meet the pressing needs of a great body of men and women. Fascism—and let us add communism and other totalitarian movements—is a desperate attempt to check this disintegration by identifying the national economy with the political structure of the state; and to find ideological motivation in the myths of exaggerated nationalism and militarism with varying minor motifs of race and ethnic factors.

Likewise, revolution breaks out when the old culture can no longer contain its failure in the ghastly delays and impossible timetables of the past. "No change" yields to "violent change," the peace of encrusted habit yields to the peace of a militant, conquering, smashing minority. This new synthesis does not solve the problem; it only transfers it to another context which very likely is an even more difficult one.

Indeed, the social pathologists give us a picture of war as a series of concentric circles: arising because of multiform causation, essentially expressing social disorganization, then, in turn, becoming the cause of new disorganization. Which is to say that war vacillates from effect of disorganization to cause of disorganization and back to effect and, again, cause. In any case, a vicious circle with only one sure result: the deepening and expansion of disorganization.

A footnote on this general analysis comes from P. A. Sorokin. Broadly speaking, his researches confirm the above approach—and this is not a blanket endorsement of some dubious aspects of his sensate-ideational typology, in the main an oversimplified typology for looking at all human history. But Sorokin is one of the great research masters of our time who can be debated but never ignored.

Sorokin also sees war, criminality, revolution, suicide, mental disease, and impoverishment as the symptoms and the consequences

of the crisis. The sense of right and wrong disappear, the theistic absolute disappears, contractural obligations are taken lightly and the sensate hungers are made paramount. Into this morass comes brute force as the arbiter of culture. Now the problem is reduced to an "interplay of physical forces in a system of physical mechanics." In a key paragraph Sorokin declares: "Periods of transition from one fundamental form of culture and society to another—when the old sociocultural edifice is crumbling and no new structure has yet been erected, when sociocultural values have become almost completely 'atomized' and the clash of values of different persons and groups utterly irreconcilable—inevitably produce a struggle of the utmost intensity, marked by the widest diversity of forms. Within a society it assumes, in addition to other conflicts, the form of an increase of crime and brutal punishment, and especially of an explosion of riots, revolts, and revolutions. Within a set of societies it manifests itself in an explosion of international wars. The greater, the more profound the transition, the more violent the outburst of revolutions, wars, and crime and punishment, if these are not drowned in an ocean of mass brutality of wars and revolutions. Such periods are invariably times of cruelty, brutality and bestiality unrestrained by anything except mutual force and fraud."

War then is symptom and consequence of cultural crisis. Since our time is "the bloodiest crisis of the bloodiest century" it follows that our cultural disintegration is the most acute of all history. The obvious conclusion of Sorokin is, "In the light of our theory we may safely hazard the guess that so long as the transition period lasts, and until the advent of a new ideational or idealistic society and culture, war will continue to maintain its dominant role in human relationships. Even if an armistice were to be signed tomorrow, it would represent merely an interlude, to be followed by an even more terrible and catastrophic Armageddon."

War is thus the *symptom* of cultural sickness, the *consequence* of cultural sickness, the *proof* of cultural sickness. It urgently points to problems which must be dealt with in the culture apart from war. And once again, it raises grave questions over the figure of war as a tool on the shelf of anti-tyranny. The tool of war has, of course, been on many other shelves variously marked plunder, tribute, extermination, imperialism, scapegoat, and military glory. But assume for the moment that the tool of war is on the shelf of anti-tyranny. Now we pick up a weapon which is like a scalpel covered with disease germs, wielded by a surgeon with dirty hands who has

an advanced case of typhoid fever. Out of this use of the tool of war comes the further spread of disease, and, eventually, the death of the patient and the surgeon. In some such fashion we get the picture presented by the social pathologist as he studies war.

From the first vantage point, war as rooted in the totality of culture, we suggested that war domineers then dissolves the individual; from the second that war is a dynamic cultural order with its own sovereign assumptions defying those who would yoke it to other cultural tasks; and now war is seen as effect of our social disorganization which becomes the bearer and cause of still further breakdown.

4. *The fourth contribution comes from social psychology by which war is considered an aggressive socio-psychological mechanism to provide release from frustration.* The major division is between those who approach the subject from the viewpoint of the group and those who approach it from the viewpoint of the individual. Some conceive of culture as a characteristic of the group manifesting itself in the behavior of individuals; others see personality as the characteristic of the individuals manifested in group relations. Folk psychologists and crowd psychologists tend to assume the priority of the group; personality analysts and behaviorists, the priority of the individual; and the interactionists have started with the interaction of individuals with the group and in different groups. Consider some of the major schools of thought climaxed by the frustration-aggression outlook.

(*a*) *The Folk psychologists* like Wundt and Durkheim have started with ethnic and linguistic materials to explain the origin of social groups and their variations. Each group is unique with a collective mind or *Volkgeist.* War becomes a struggle for existence between groups with very limited ability for adjustment. With self-preservation and expansion basic to group life, a balance of power appears as the only possible answer.

(*b*) *The Crowd psychologists* such as Le Bon and Waelder distinguish crowds, mobs, or masses from normal associations. The individual is hypnotized in "mass" situations while in associational situations the group is a co-operative venture of the members to achieve its purposes. Masses result from regression whereby the individual abandons the effort to integrate his personality through conscience and reverts to an infantile following of authority. The war situation comes through this mass reaction and the failure to develop associations. War is mass militaristic hypnosis. Peace is associational harmony.

(*c*) *Behaviorists* of the John B. Watson type stress the individual rather than the group. They locate the issue in terms of a circular stimulus-response mechanism. War comes about because the masses are conditioned by propaganda for the response of mass violence. The need is for restraint of propagandistic conditioning for war and freedom of the individual to criticize the group while cooperating with social controls.

(*d*) *Social interactionists* such as Park and Burgess stress the interaction of individuals within the group and in different groups. Conflict arises out of these lines of intersection.

(*e*) *Personality analysts* draw heavily on Freud to see war as a process of social conditioning and identification with the state permitting aggressions to be projected upon an eternal enemy—with these aggressions growing out of the frustrations of parental discipline. Aggressive personalities are the leaders who overcompensate because of a sense of inferiority. Thus war comes primarily from *within* the individual.

The Yale social psychologists led by John Dollard have given this hypothesis its definitive expression in the volume, *Frustration and Aggression* (Yale, 1939). Aggression is always a consequence of frustration, according to the major affirmation of this thesis. This aggressive behavior may move in several directions: against a frustrating agent, the innocent bystander, or against self. Moreover, the aggression is expressed with a variety of force and form, yet the strength of the aggression varies closely with the amount of the frustration.

This approach has had fresh support from the 1947 UNESCO conference which published its papers under the title *Tensions That Cause Wars* (U. of Illinois, 1950). The conference heard papers from highly varying backgrounds on "an understanding of the development and perpetuation of attitudes which make for national aggression and, on the basis of their findings to recommend ways and means of promoting attitudes which would increase international understanding." American, Brazilian, French, British, and Hungarian sociologists, philosophers, and psychiatrists participated in the discussions.

In general a picture emerges of international tensions originating in the anxieties of men driven to seek and to use malevolent "security processes." This psychological and psychiatric approach was rather basically accepted for immediate causation. But the "long run" causation of war as seen in hunger, exploitation, tradition, and social structure conditions the warlike expectations and

anxieties. The individual and social factors tend to supplement one another.

The Hungarian Marxist present argued that tensions are neither good nor bad in themselves: "Some tensions may serve the cause of human progress and contribute materially toward a better and more just social structure, even though they may be violent and may involve considerable social sacrifice."[1] This suggests that violent solutions are necessary. The inner psychological problem, according to this Marxist, is the devastating moral pluralism of modern man or, as he prefers to say, "the split morality of bourgeois society"; for example, the good family-man father who is an exploiter of labor. This split can only be solved at the material level.

In the common statement of the UNESCO Tension Project the following summary points are made:

1. Wars are not necessary nor inevitable in terms of human nature.
2. The problem of peace is to keep group and national tensions within manageable proportions.
3. A major need in avoiding national aggression is to destroy frustration rooted in economic injustice.
4. Modern wars are fostered by myths, symbols, and traditions of national pride.
5. National self-righteousness is still taught by many parents and teachers.
6. Modern communications are partly a peaceful and partly warlike influence.
7. Colonial exploitation has no basis in ethnic fact.
8. Social scientists are badly separated by national, ideological, and class differences with objectivity difficult, co-operation urgent.
9. The physical and biological sciences have increased tensions through atomic and biological warfare.
10. Social science must help to release mankind from the terrible dilemma: kill or be killed.

A somewhat similar position was taken by 2,400 American psychologists in 1944 in what is now known as *"The Psychologists' Manifesto,"* representing the "most definite consensus of opinion on a psychological problem which has ever been achieved. . . ." Again the basic assumption is (*a*) that frustrations and conflicting interests lie at the root of aggression; (*b*) these can be reduced and redirected by social engineering.

[1] Hadley Cantril, ed., *Tensions That Cause Wars,* (Urbana, 1950), 23.

Only a brief comment will be given to show that the above thesis is subject to criticism by psychologists. Otto Klineberg doubts if one can prove that the relation between frustration and aggression is invariable. Others suggest that while frustration frequently leads to aggression it does not do so invariably. Yet almost all psychologists admit that frustration frequently does produce some form of aggression, and that this is fundamental in the understanding of war.

Let me hasten to add that social psychologists also criticize pacifists for being negative and punitive, unduly concerned about the evils rather than the causes of war; that pacifists are neurotic, escapist and suicidal.

Note, however, that even Dollard and Miller have admitted that the frustration-aggression series is more socially conditioned than they had thought and that social psychology on the social side admits the powerful conditioning role of propaganda, prejudice, nationalism, ethnocentrism and other such factors. Thus wars have deep roots in both the individual and his culture. In either case, war —any war—is an expression of a psychological sickness rooted in human nature and culture. And war is a kind of scapegoat, projecting this sickness on others.

Twenty years ago Devere Allen pointed out in his *Fight for Peace* that James 4:1 is the most quoted text in the literature of the early peace movement: *"From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?"* War comes from evil desire, says the early peace movement's "golden text." In this they anticipated the vast literature of modern psychology which unquestionably considers war as rooted in the warring lusts and inner drives of human personality.

The psychologists have a curious blend of optimism and pessimism: a rejection of the idea that war is inevitable and a dark analysis of the depth of war in human nature.

The Christian faith must exercise caution around a discipline like social psychology which usually operates on fully secular premises. Yet psychology has often been closer to Biblical anthropology than the sentimental theology of some within the church itself. Surely this material of the social psychologists raises serious questions over the figure of picking up war as a tool to rout the lesser-of-the-two-evils' tyranny. Rather, we see individuals and cultures crazily driven toward the sword because they are blocked and thwarted. And, that a long continuum of social conditioning has suggested that war is a desirable means for solving the problem which is externalized now in the enemy. Thus war diverts attention

from the *real* problem which is *my* problem. Thus, the drive to kill and destroy arises when *my* problem inexorably moves toward a false solution of aggressive violence. Or, war is *our* problem because of a broad propagandistic conditioning for war which takes attention away from our *real* problem in terms of social changes which would restrain, lessen or destroy tensions.

Clearly, social psychology has piled up much evidence which cannot be ignored. There is no suggestion that only the wars of our enemies result from "the lusts that war in your members." The judgment applies to both sides of the military conflict. Once again, the concept of the static neutrality of war is obliterated in the dynamic existentialism of war as a system. War is both deep and broad in human life. War is not a tool; it is an expression of illness, a symptom of sickness; the climax in a series; and the outer expression of inner conflict.

Christian theology will never feel compelled to consult the findings of modern social science as though the Gospel must be adjusted to the last minute affirmations of secular thought. Today the Christian community quite properly is more in the mood to demand adjustments of secularism to the Gospel based on a sense of God's sovereignty and the truth of revealed religion. This is a basic achievement which must not be annulled.

On the other hand, theology cannot ignore the social sciences, particularly when it embraces an ancient system of belief and behavior such as war. To be sure, this is not to say that the social sciences are a body of Christian pacifist materials. It is only to suggest a context, or a frame of reference, which Christian theology must not ignore lest it develop abstractions out of touch with the orders of creation and the concrete realities of life.

This paper is also written on the assumption that political studies have unduly dominated the concerns of Christian thinkers as they have struggled with war. Political science is primarily concerned with order, law, justice and power—all legitimate concerns. But the total range of knowledge about war includes the materials provided by numerous other disciplines.

The Harvard scholars who contributed the paper, "Toward a Common Language for the Area of Social Sciences," suggest that complexities must be dealt with through conceptual abstractions; and that different scientists characteristically employ different abstractions. The common properties of social scientists rest on these affirmations: "All 'social sciences' deal with living organisms which have certain physiological propensities ('psychology') but who

learn (also 'psychology') to surrender, to some degree, their physiological autonomy to cultural ('anthropology') control. The traditional modes of behaving ('anthropology') concretely take form, however, as interactions of human beings living in organized groups and institutionalized relationships ('sociology'). This culturally patterned ('anthropology') behavior ('psychology') in organized groups and institutions ('sociology') tends to become structured into types of activity of peculiar importance ('economics and government'). Finally, the precise nature of these types (and the general nature of the culture and society as well) has a perspective in time ('history'). The processes that determine events are imbedded not only in the innate nature of human beings ('psychology') and in the structured interrelationships which prevail between human beings at a given time level ('anthropology,' and 'economics,' and 'government,' and 'sociology') but also in the sequential development of these forms of time ('history')."

This remarkable quotation shows something of the overview of modern social science. Obviously, this is a time-bound conception of things which does not see both time and eternity, which is without an eschatology, and, above all, is without a doctrine of redemption leading to a redeemed community within the matrix of culture. Moreover, the master theme of the Christian Gospel and Christian ethic, namely, *agape*-love, is absent except for its use by psychologists in an essentially un-Biblical manner.

Yet these categories of social science seem to be a two-edged sword: on the one hand, they radically call into question the view of war as other than a pathological aspect of human life; on the other, the ancient persistence of the war system seems to defy the nonconformist. The latter point does not imply that the social sciences consider war as inevitable—indeed, a rather robust optimism pervades the thinking of man since they view wars as a man-made social habit which could be eradicated. Liberal secularism is seldom pessimistic in a successful young culture like ours. Confronted with what Europe has faced, this attitude either becomes nihilistic-existential or Christian.

Much more work remains to be done in this field. Provisionally, the Christian pacifist conviction that war is evil, sinful, and satanic seems confirmed by social science. Optimism about using war for even relatively good objectives seems unfounded. Optimism about war as neutral or static seems unfounded.

Meanwhile, the opposition to war calls for the total resources of the Gospel, triumphantly sounding the trumpets of the kingdom

of God through the church as a remnant of faith, hope, and love. Evil based on untruth must not be considered superior to the truth of Christ incarnated in His disciples. Even ancient habits of collective sin can be faced with the confidence of the faith. Insofar as war is a manifestation of the total culture it must await the total coming of the kingdom for its final defeat. But the present reality of the kingdom, working through a brotherhood of love under Christ as Lord, makes it immediately possible to decisively break with war as total cultural manifestation, as intricate cultural order within the culture, as social disorganization, as fruit of inner psychological turmoil and social conditioning!

Because of the radical character of the witness against war, it is possible for pacifists to have a pathological fringe surrounding their own group—especially when separated from the cleansing and purifying power of Christ Himself. Escapist, negativist, neurotic, suicidal are some of the charges. Alas, these have been true of some attempting the tremendous task of breaking with war. But perversions of Christian love must never disqualify the eternal commission given by our Lord to love our neighbors whether friends or enemies.

PETER RIEDEMANN ON ORIGINAL SIN AND THE WAY OF REDEMPTION

ROBERT FRIEDMANN

Of Peter Riedemann, the outstanding Hutterite leader and teacher, and of his great confession of faith of 1540, called *Account of our Religion, Doctrine and Faith,* the MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW recently published a valuable study by Franz Heimann, which allowed a profound insight into the doctrinal and theological thinking of genuine Anabaptistism.[1] Most appropriately Heimann centered his attention in the main upon two points only, namely the teachings concerning the church and the common life (*Kirche, Gemeinschaft*), in which fields the Anabaptists distinguished themselves so signally from the great Protestant bodies. It is, however, obvious that these two points by no means exhaust the specifically Anabaptist views and teachings, and further inquiries into the *Account* are called for. The theology of the Anabaptists, a matter long neglected or misunderstood, is perhaps the most urgent problem at present in our research; it demands greater clarification of specific concepts and viewpoints. Although Heimann's study has much to offer in this line, one particular problem has been completely neglected in it, namely that of "original sin" and redemption. Has Riedemann, have the Hutterites, something essential to say concerning these two theological issues? Did they accept the general Protestant viewpoints, or did they ignore these questions altogether as did, for instance, the "Schleitheim Articles" of 1527? No doubt this is a central problem which might decide much regarding the "orthodoxy" of the Anabaptists and the question whether they may be classified as a strictly Protestant group or not. If not (and the present writer tends to incline to this position), Anabaptism would represent a distinctive type of Christian witnessing alongside of Catholicism and classic Protestantism.[2]

[1] The recently published English version of the *Account* etc., prepared by the Society of the Brothers, known as Hutterians, Bromdon, Bridgenorth, England, 1950 (reviewed *MQR,* April 1952), deserves widest attention wherever the Anabaptist genius and vision is under discussion.

[2] It has been pointed out that the later Lutherans and especially Lutheran "orthodoxy" of the 17th and 18th centuries misunderstood and even perverted Luther's position on major points. See for instance Aulen's great study of the history of the doctrine of the atonement (*Christus Victor,* 1931) in which he claims that later Lutheranism misunderstood Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, and that Luther actually conceived of the atonement as Christ's victory over sin by which the believer is also delivered from the actual bondage of sin and not just "justified." Dietrich Bonhöffer in his *Cost of Discipleship* (*Die Nachfolge Christi*) has severely castigated the Lutheran Church for its perversion of the doctrine of justification and the use of "cheap grace" whereby the sinner is in effect justified in his sin instead of out of it.

The doctrines of original sin and of justification by faith alone, pillars of Luther's theological edifice, find their main roots in a particular interpretation or emphasis of parts of the Epistle to the Romans and related Pauline writings. It is therefore of major interest to study what Anabaptists, and now especially Riedemann, were discovering in the same Scriptural sources. If a different reading of the same texts was possible, or at least a different emphasis as to their place in the total understanding of redemption, then the move toward the "radical" Christian way was inescapable. In the latter case "justification by faith alone" should not be the major concern of an earnest Christian. Expected from him is rather the passionate rejection of sin altogether. The new birth, the sanctification of life and the preparation of God's kingdom on earth are then more in the center of concern than the aforementioned doctrines with their inherent temptation toward spiritual relaxation. "Obedience unto righteousness'" (Rom. 6:16) is then more central than justification by faith. And original sin, though not denied (on the contrary recognized as the very cause of physical death) is reinterpreted as an inherited inclination and tendency to sin which the regenerated man can and must fight.

In the great doctrinal tract of Riedemann, whose first and more important part covers about 130 pages, the section on "original sin" covers not more than three pages[3]; the term "justification by faith" does not appear at all (one might assume that the brethren did not read Luther's tracts), and the classical loci for it, such as Rom. 3:28; 4:5; 11:6; and Gal. 2:16, etc., are quoted nowhere. Immediately following this part (pp. 56-59), a chapter appears entitled, "How man may again find God and His grace" (pp. 59-68), subdivided into the sections, "Concerning remorse"; "Concerning repentance"; "Man is grafted into Christ"; and finally "Concerning the old and the new covenant." A reproduction of the entire section here seems to be appropriate; it will make possible a more concrete discussion of the issue and will help towards a better understanding of the specific "Christianity of the Anabaptists," insofar as we accept Riedemann as a good representative for it.

What Sin Is

Sin is, in essence, the forsaking of obedience to God, or disobedience (Gen. 3:6), and from this all else that is wrong hath come, as branches grow from the tree. Evil hath now taken the upper hand in the world, and still increaseth daily, so that men proceed from iniquity to iniquity, because they have yielded and committed their members to serve sin.

[8] Most Anabaptist sources do not mention original sin at all.

Now all unrighteousness is sin, as John saith, but disobedience is the mother of all sin. For as, through obedience, all the righteousness of God cometh through Christ (Rom. 5:16-19), so also cometh all sin and unrighteousness from disobedience to and the forsaking of God's command.

Concerning Original Sin

Just here there ariseth oft very much quarreling and strife, for the one wanteth this and the other that; from which strife cometh more destruction than betterment, for since God is not a God of quarreling but a God of peace and love, He hath no pleasure in strife, neither hath He aught to do with the same, hence there is naught therein save destruction.

Now, therefore, we confess and teach that all men save Christ only have a sinful nature which they inherit from Adam, as it is written, "The imagination and desire of man's heart is evil from youth" (Gen. 8:21). David saith likewise "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." Paul speaketh clearly, and saith, "By one man sin entered into the world and passed upon all men." Because then it hath come upon us all from him, it is thereby clear that we have inherited it from him.

What Original Sin Is

But the inheritance that we all have from our father Adam, is the inclination to sin; that all of us have by nature a tendency toward evil and to have pleasure in sin. (II Esdras 3:21-22.) This inheritance manifesteth and showeth itself in all the children of Adam, and removeth, devoureth, and consumeth all that is good and of God in man; so that none may attain it again except he be born again. (John 3:3-5).

This inheritance Paul nameth the messenger of Satan, who striketh him on the head or buffeteth him with fists, and speaketh thereby of the movement of the sinful inclination which stirreth in him, as in all men. Therefore saith John also, "He who saith he hath no sin, deceiveth himself, and the truth is not in him," and speaketh thereby of the inheritance which we all have from Adam, which he calleth sin; as also David saith in the book of Psalms: "In sin was I conceived and born." Thus through Adam we have all become sinful and must be justified through Christ, if we would have life with Him.

The Harm Wrought by Original Sin

Original sin, we say, is first the cause of physical death for men, for originally they were created and placed in life, so that there was naught corrupt in them. For God did not make death. Since, however, we all inherited sin, all, both young and old, we must taste of death. In truth if Christ were not sent and come into the world there would be no more hope of life. Because, however, it was planned from the beginning by the Father, and because Christ hath come into the world and become the reconciliation not only for us but also for the whole world (I John 2:1, 2), we believe that he hath brought it about that original sin before it stirreth within man leading to further sin now causeth physical death only and not eternal, that the word might be fulfilled: The children shall not bear the iniquities of the fathers (Ezek. 18:20, also 33:10-19), but he who sinneth shall himself die. Accordingly, we say that God also accepteth little children, as such, for indeed Christ is also their reconciler. (I John 2).

Secondly, we say that original sin is also the cause of eternal death to man, in that it leadeth, guideth, and bringeth man into all sins, and through it we do much sin; for this is the sin, that stirreth up, rouseth, and bringeth

to pass all other sins within us, as Paul declareth when he saith: "Sin, that it might appear sin, worketh death in me by that which is good, that it might become exceedingly sinful by the commandment" (Rom. 7:13).

Thus, therefore, all men have died in Adam, fallen away from God and forsaken him, as it is written, "There is none righteous, no not one, there is no fear of God before their eyes" (Rom. 3:10-18). Thus we show men how far they have estranged themselves from God and submerged themselves in their sin.

We show them also that all sin hath its source and origin in wrong taking, that man taketh what he should not and what is not his, and leaveth what he ought to take, loveth what he ought to hate and hateth what he ought to love. Thus man is turned aside and led away from God by that which should point and lead him to God, teach him to know God, and show him God. Thus, if one would come to God he must leave and deny what he hath previously wrongly taken, that is, all that is temporal and transitory, to cleave to God alone. This is true repentance that the Lord demandeth and desireth.

Now Followeth How Man May Again Find God and His Grace Concerning Remorse

But he who would truly repent with all his heart must first feel real remorse for his sin. . . . For true remorse followeth the recognition of sin. (II Samuel 12:13-17).

Now he who is sorry for his sin and regretteth having obeyed it ought and must henceforth all the more diligently guard himself against it, and flee from it as from a serpent. . . .

Concerning Repentance

Thus remorse leadeth to true repentance, that is real humiliation and abasement before God because of the transgression . . . which shame bringeth a real turning point (*eine rechte Wiederkehr*), so that the man runneth with haste, calleth, crieth, and prayeth to God for forgiveness and grace, and beginneth at the same time to bring the flesh into subjection (I Cor. 9:24 f.). . . . As David saith, "I lifted up mine eyes unto the hills to see from whence help would come to me, even so cometh my help from the Lord. . . ." Every anxious, troubled, fearful, broken, and contrite heart, if it flees to Him, will find with Him peace and comfort. . . .

We point out also thereby that no such "deathbed remorse" and repentance as the world hath (which saith today, "I am sorry for my sin" and yet doeth the same again tomorrow) can stand before God and receive grace; but only that which proceedeth from a sincere heart. To such an one will God draw nigh and will both begin and bring to perfection His work in him. (James 4:1-10).

Man Is Grafted into Christ

. . . We teach further that Christ came into the world to make sinners blessed. (I Tim. 1:15). . . . Now because Christ is the root and the vine, and we are grafted into Him, through faith, even as the sap riseth from the root and maketh the branches fruitful (Rom. 11:16), even so the Spirit of Christ riseth from the root, Christ, into the branches or twigs to make them all fruitful. . . .

God made His covenant firstly with Adam, and then also with Abraham and his seed, and now hath made it with us through Christ (Heb.

7:18) and established and confirmed it through His death . . . that we, redeemed from death through Him, might be children of His convenant (Acts 3:17) and that the same might be ours eternally.

Concerning the New Covenant

. . . God hath established, revealed and brought to light a covenant that is perfect, that abideth unchanged throughout eternity . . . (Heb. 7:18; Jer. 8:1-3).

This covenant is a covenant of grace, the revelation and the knowledge of God. . . . This knowledge, however, cometh alone from the receiving of the Holy Spirit. . . .

This is the covenant of childlike freedom; of which we also are the children if we let ourselves be sealed by this covenant and submit and surrender ourselves to its working. . . . Therefore saith Paul, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and let not yourselves be entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (Gal. 5:1-4). For if ye let again yourselves be led into the yoke of bondage, then are ye led from the Spirit to the letter, and Christ profiteth you nothing. For which reason those who have not the Spirit are not the children of this covenant.

It cannot be denied that this is a genuinely Christian document of high originality. That it proposes an interpretation of the doctrine of original sin not found in the reformers is likewise obvious. Riedemann's main locus for an understanding of this doctrine is, surprisingly enough, Ezek. 18:20, which on its part refers back to Deut. 24:16. There can be no "hereditary guilt" (from which no human being could ever escape) for we have the promise of God that "the children shall not bear the iniquities of the fathers." It is perhaps for this reason that the Old Testament never emphasizes the idea of original sin yet rather prepares the soil for the doctrine of the changed heart, the new birth. As the doctrine of original sin loses its crushing gravity (which Luther so painfully felt) it is quite in line that no theology of the atonement appears in these pages.[4] Man is called to active co-operation with God (I Cor. 3:9), to be sure, however, only after he has entered the state of rebirth. It is this state, therefore, which man has to search and to long for. The way to redemption leads through remorse and repentance to the point where the believer is ready to enter the "new covenant" of grace. It is "the covenant of childlike freedom," as Riedemann says; and it is granted to the believer only after he has submitted and surrendered to the working of this covenant. A

[4] There is a short tract by an unknown early Anabaptist entitled, "Concerning the Satisfaction of Christ" (translated and edited by John C. Wenger in *MQR*, XX, 1946, 243-254), but upon careful study one will discover that actually it does not deal at all with the doctrine of atonement as taught by the great Protestant theologians.

modern Christian author has called this way to redemption very graphically "costly grace."[5] It is quite clear that such a way has nothing pietistic in it, nothing sweet or emotional, nothing to be enjoyed only. It is but a natural consequence of such a vision that it implies also a new form of human relationship, a new thought concerning the brother and fellow believer, a uniting with him at the Lord's Table and in life at large.

[5] Dietrich Bonhöffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (New York, 1949) 37ff.

THE HISTORY OF THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S BIBLE MEETING[1] IN THE MENNONITE CHURCH

PAUL M. LEDERACH

"The Christian Endeavor Society must be recognized as the greatest movement in religious education of the past century," recently declared a historian of the movement.[2] The Christian Endeavor movement was launched by Francis E. Clark in 1881. Four months after its organization in the Williston Congregational Church of Portland, Maine, six societies held their first convention in Portland. By 1889 there were 6,500 delegates to the convention in Philadelphia, and at the convention held in Minneapolis in 1891 there were 14,000 delegates.

The success of the Christian Endeavor movement was due in a large measure to the Sunday school, for few, if any, of the Endeavor's constituents were not enrolled at some time in the Sunday school. Furthermore, Christian Endeavor was a valuable supplement to the Sunday school in that it provided opportunities for expressional activities.[3]

While the major denominations were becoming youth conscious and were encouraging expressional activities through Christian Endeavor or other denominational youth organizations, the Mennonite Church also was beginning to develop a program for her youth.

It is the purpose of this chapter to trace the development of Young People's Bible Meeting, in a sense the Mennonite counterpart of Christian Endeavor.

I. THE COMING OF THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S BIBLE MEETING

The first Young People's Bible Meeting. The Young People's Bible Meeting as a movement had its beginning in various communities at about the same time. Some groups called their meetings "Edification Meetings," others used such names as "Bible Class," "Bible Reading," "Workers' Meeting," "Sunday Evening Bible Class," etc. The early meetings seemed to grow out of defi-

[1] At first the Young People's Bible Meeting was known as the "young people's meeting." Later, the name was spelled with capital letters, "Young People's Meeting." For a long time "Young People's Meeting" and "Young People's Bible Meeting" were used interchangeably. This is true today; however, "Young People's Bible Meeting" is the preferred form.

[2] Benson, Clarence H. *A Popular History of Christian Education.* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1943), 206.

[3] *Ibid.,* 204-207.

nitely felt needs and an urge on the part of the young people to have gatherings in the home. Occasionally social gatherings led into profitable Bible studies. For example, in a certain community a group of young people had gathered at a wedding. During the evening as the group sought for a profitable way to spend its time, someone suggested the studying of the Book of Romans. The study proved so enjoyable that other meetings were arranged, and out of that grew the present Young People's Bible Meeting. In Ontario, Canada, the young people carried on a weekly program of visiting shut-ins.[4]

These midweek activities led to the organization of Young People's Bible Meeting. The first official action taken by any conference to approve youth gatherings may be found in the Minutes of the Ontario Mennonite Conference for 1877.[5]

John Funk was as active in the establishment of the Young People's Bible Meeting as he was in the promotion of the Sunday school. Funk received his first impressions of a young people's meeting during his stay as a young man in Chicago. There he attended his first young people's meeting, in the company of D. L. Moody, at the Methodist Church at the corner of Clarke and Washington Streets.[6]

Probably the first Young People's Meeting to meet on Sunday evenings and in a Mennonite meetinghouse grew out of a children's meeting conducted by John Funk along with Henry Brenneman and Joseph Summers in the Prairie Street Mennonite Church, Elkhart, Indiana. The earliest recorded meeting of this children's meeting was August 31, 1884.[7] In these early meetings the children had no part in the program but to help to sing and to listen to the discussions given for their benefit.

It must be remembered that late in the nineteenth century young people did not become members of the Church until early adulthood or following marriage, and it was not until 1887-88 that there was an addition to the Prairie Street Church of young people from the congregation.[8] In 1887 the children's meeting was changed to "Young People's Meeting"; and after that date, the meetings were

[4] John L. Horst and others, *Handbook for Young People's Bible Meeting Workers.* (Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Mennonite Publishing House, 1936), 7.

[5] *Loc. cit.*

[6] John F. Funk materials, Archives, Mennonite Historical Library.

[7] S. F. Coffman, "Origin of Y.P.M. with Special Reference to Prairie Street Church at Elkhart, Indiana," Mennonite Historical Library.

[8] *Loc. cit.*

frequently conducted by the young people as a part of their service and testimony.[9]

Samuel Brunk of Harrisonburg, Virginia, in writing of his visit to the Indiana Mennonite Church Conference in 1887 states that he had "the pleasure of being present at the young people's meeting in Elkhart." He reported that this "meeting is held every two weeks expressly for instruction of the young by singing, reading from the Holy Scripture, exhortation and prayer."[10]

The spread of the Young People's Bible Meeting. Probably the second Young People's Meeting was established by C. Z. Yoder in the Oak Grove congregation near Smithville, Ohio, in 1889.[11] In 1887 C. Z. Yoder conducted meetings for young people in the Paradise Church, a Dunkard or union meetinghouse at Smithville, Ohio. At first the meetings were like the "singings" of the Amish or Mennonite young people held as early as 1865. Yoder's meetings gained in popularity until they were one of the chief subjects of discussion in the local congregation. At an important meeting of the Oak Grove congregation on January 4, 1889, the church leader pleaded with the congregation to permit the young people's meeting to meet in their own building. The congregation consented, and the result was the organization of a Young People's Bible Meeting May 4, 1889. Meetings were held every Sunday evening. One of the leading exercises was the study of the next Sunday school lesson. Accounts of this Young People's Meeting appeared at various times in the pages of the *Herald of Truth.* In 1890 M. S. Steiner wrote:

> Sunday, the 4th of May, was spent among the Amish brethren near Smithville. It was my pleasure to meet many friends here and a prospering Sunday School. In the evening I was privileged to meet with them at their singing, or better, Young People's Meeting. The brethren come together every Sunday evening to read and study their next Sunday School lesson, sing and hear addresses by some of the teachers.
>
> I think the plan a good one and especially where many young people gather. Young minds are active, and if good principles are not placed before them, they will engage in something that has a tendency to destroy pure motives and Christian characteristics.[12]

In 1891 a member of Oak Grove wrote:

> In connection with our Sunday school we have a young people's meeting held alternately at Oak Grove and Pleasant Hill. In connection with

[9] *Loc. cit.*
[10] *Herald of Truth,* XXV (January 1, 1888), 9.
[11] John Umble, "The First Y.P.B.M.?" *Gospel Herald,* XXX (October 4, 1928), 554.
[12] *Herald of Truth,* XXVII (June 1, 1890), 170.

these services we spend some time in singing. Then we read over the Sunday-school lesson for the coming Sunday and ask questions pertaining to the lesson. Then we spend some time in repeating Scripture verses on a certain subject or containing a certain Key-word. Then we usually have an address from some of the older members. Last Sunday evening Bro. C. Z. Yoder spoke to us on "Non-resistance." We will also have addresses on "Secret Societies," "The Evils of Intemperance," etc. [13]

Probably the third regularly organized Young People's Meeting was established at the Zion Mennonite Church near Bluffton, Ohio. This Young People's Meeting was organized as a result of a series of evangelistic meetings held in 1892 by D. H. Bender, who encouraged Young People's Meetings everywhere he went.

In Ontario, immediately after the first evangelistic meetings in Waterloo County, which were held by J. S. Coffman in 1891 and 1892, the young people who came into the Church at that time held meetings for worship and testimony in private homes in the district. They were called "Edification Meetings." It was in 1896 that these meetings were approved by Conference and were held in the meetinghouses:

Resolved, that edification meetings (generally known as "Young People's Meetings") may be held in the meetinghouses.[14]

In 1892 the Southwestern Pennsylvania Conference went on record as favoring Bible Classes and Young People's Meetings. The following year the Indiana-Michigan Amish Mennonite Conference took similar action. By 1892 there were Young People's Meetings in Illinois, and in 1894 the Western District Conference of Amish Mennonites resolved:

That this conference advocate such meetings, and that steps should be taken to introduce them where they are not yet held. We believe that such meetings, when conducted in accordance with the Word of God, are edifying, and a blessing to the church, only that due care be exercised that they are in charge of and conducted by the church, so that not the young people only, but the older members, also, can take part in them.[15]

In 1893 a Young People's Meeting was established in the Oak Grove Church, West Liberty, Ohio. In this community, the home of the first permanent Sunday school, the Young People's Meeting was organized to provide a means of expression for those who had been receiving a measure of training in the Sunday school. Before this

[13] *Herald of Truth,* XXVIII (May 15, 1891), 153.

[14] "Report of the Annual Conference of Canada," *Herald of Truth,* 33 (July 1, 1896), 203.

[15] *Herald of Truth,* XXXI (October 15, 1894), 310.

time no evening meetings had been conducted in this community except informal singings held from house to house often on Sunday evenings. From the first the Young People's Meeting was well attended. The program was conducted in English. There was considerable singing, a Scripture reading and prayer, and some short talks. At the close a leader was appointed to arrange a program for the next meeting.[16]

During the period from 1890 to 1910 the wave of interest spread throughout all sections of the Church. The spread was most rapid, however, in Ohio and the middle western states. The East, as always, was wary of the new movement. In 1900 A. B. Kolb in an editorial in the *Herald of Truth* attempted to explain the basis of enthusiasm for Young People's Meetings in the West:

> Those who have in the past been moving westward from our eastern congregations were largely young people, and in organizing congregations and ordaining ministers these young people were proportionately in evidence. Then too, the same reason has caused the young people in the West to be prominent in numbers and influence in the Sunday school work, in which as well as in young people's meetings which are almost general in the western congregations, many of these young people have gained ability and recognition as speakers and workers.[17]

It may be that one of the reasons the Young People's Meeting did not find wider acceptance in all parts of the Church was that as the Sunday school was opposed because of its non-Mennonite origin, so the Young People's Meeting was opposed because it smacked of Christian Endeavor.[18]

With the exchange of ideas from community to community Young People's Meetings were better organized and grew in extent and influence. They gradually received official recognition and promotion by church organization. The last issue of the *Herald of Truth* in 1906 devoted a page to the Young People's Bible Meeting. In 1908 the *Gospel Herald* began publishing lessons for use in Young People's Meetings, and in 1909 General Conference appointed a committee to prepare Young People's Meeting topics for a period of two years. More will be said concerning this in the section devoted to curriculum development.

[16] John Umble, "Early Sunday Schools at West Liberty, Ohio," *Mennonite Quarterly Review,* IV (January, 1930), 47.

[17] *Herald of Truth,* XXXVII (October 1, 1900).

[18] Concerning Christian Endeavor: "The Christian Endeavor movement as carried on at present is in our opinion useless in a congregation that is alive to its duties," *Herald of Truth,* XXXI (July 15, 1894), 210; "It is inconsistent for our members to take part in Christian Endeavor Societies, Epworth Leagues, etc.," Missouri Conference action, *Herald of Truth,* XXXI (October 15, 1894), 314.

In the early period of the Young People's Meeting development, in addition to John Funk, C. Z. Yoder, and D. H. Bender, other leaders should be mentioned: in Canada, M. C. Cressman and Israel Shantz;[19] and in the midwest, A. B. Kolb, M. S. Steiner, Charles McClintic, C. K. Hostetler, and John Horsch.[20]

The Young People's Meeting movement was akin in spirit to the Sunday school movement in that it sought to provide for the needs of young people by way of instruction and expression. The Sunday school conferences promoted young people's work. As pointed out earlier, the Sunday School Conference of 1892 advocated the publication of a young people's paper. The third Sunday School Conference in 1894 recognized the Young People's Meeting as a teaching agency of the Church and gave over a part of its sessions to the discussion of the Church at work in the Young People's Meeting.

II. Problems of Young People's Bible Meetings

By 1914 there were eighty regularly organized Young People's Meetings throughout the Church.[21] On one hand this figure would seem to indicate a growing interest in the work of young people, but on the other, it would also seem to indicate that there were certain problems hindering a greater progress.

The place of women. One of the first problems which plagued the thinking of certain church leaders regarding the new Young People's Meetings was the place of women. As strict Biblicists, certain well-meaning brethren interpreted I Cor. 14:34, "Let your women keep silence in the churches," to mean that women should take no part whatsoever in the Young People's Meeting. And, since in almost every instance women were serving in Young People's Meetings, the whole movement was condemned. However, the majority of the church leaders were capable of healthy thinking. On this touchy matter one conference resolved:

> That as no Scripture is of private interpretation and that according to Romans 16; . . . Acts 21:8, 9, we believe that they have a right to teach, but not to usurp authority.[22]

[19] Minutes of Young People's Bible Meeting Topics Committee.

[20] Coffman, S. F., *op cit.*

[21] Daniel Kauffman, *Yearbook and Directory,* 1914 (Scottdale: Mennonite Publishing House, 1914), 5.

[22] "Missouri Mennonite Conference," *Herald of Truth,* XXXII (October 15, 1895), 315.

Even today there are certain congregations in which Young People's Meetings are not permitted, and one of the arguments defending this negative position is that it is "unscriptural" for a woman to take part.

The problem of grading. Another problem that has beset the Young People's Meeting from its inception has been that of grading. The concept of the early day, even to the present, has been that the Young People's Meeting was for both young and old. As early as 1894 someone wrote in the *Herald of Truth*:

> Our "Young People's Meetings" are giving our members ample opportunity for study and activity. And while we speak of this matter we wish to say that in our opinion the name "Young People's Meeting" is misleading, inasmuch as these meetings, if we understand rightly, are for old people as well as young people, ministers as well as laymembers, and as such is a means of grace for young and old.[23]

Again, from Mifflin County, Pennsylvania, a correspondent to the *Herald of Truth* wrote: "Sunday School is attended by the parents as well as by the children, and even by grandparents. The same thing may be said of their Young People'sMeetings."[24]

In 1929 N. E. Miller wrote:

> The present name does not fully designate the meeting and its purpose, as the meeting is for old and young, neither does the name set forth the nature of the meeting, which might or might not be of a spiritual nature and could in neither case be called a "young people's" meeting.[25]

Even today the Young People's Bible Meeting is as much an adult's meeting as a young person's meeting with both the young and old taking part. The question of whether this is good or bad has not been answered.

The problem of function. After the Young People's Meeting had found widespread acceptance, it was not long until the question was raised as to its purpose or function. In 1910 a Young People's Meeting Conference, similar in nature to district Sunday School Conferences, was held in Ontario. At this conference several purposes or functions of the Young People's Meeting were mentioned. They were: to sustain the church, to train workers, and to promote missions.[26]

[23] J. A. R. (perhaps J. A. Ressler), "Our Young People," *Herald of Truth,* XXXI (July 1, 1894), 204.

[24] *Herald of Truth,* XXXVI (February 1, 1899), 41.

[25] N. E. Miller, "Young People's Meetings," *Yearbook and Directory,* 1929 (Scottdale: Mennonite Publishing House, 1929), 23-25.

[26] "Report of the First Young People's Meeting Conference of the Mennonite Church in Waterloo County, held at the Cressman Church near Breslau, Ontario, September 5, 1910." *Gospel Herald,* III (September 22, 1910), 399.

In 1914 H. Frank Reist conducted a study of the object and values of the Young People's Bible Meeting. From his study he crystallized eight functions:

1. The Young People's Bible Meeting has a social object and value.
2. The Young People's Bible Meeting is conducive to more Bible study.
3. The Young People's Bible Meeting produces better and more efficient church workers.
4. The Young People's Bible Meeting is one of the strongest factors in the church to unify the old and young.
5. Young People's Bible Meeting is a vital factor in holding the young people for the Church.
6. The Young People's Bible Meeting aids to conserve and concentrate the activities of our young people.
7. The Young People's Bible Meeting lightens the work of the ministry.
8. The Young People's Bible Meeting helps to develop the missionary spirit.[27]

C. F. Derstine wrote in 1925 concerning the function of the Young People's Bible Meeting:

> The Young People's Meeting has two outstanding reasons for its existence as an auxiliary of the Church. The first reason is the development of the life of the attendant, the second is the need of equipment for service.[28]

In the 1929 *Mennonite Yearbook* the purposes of the Young People's Meetings were stated as providing more Bible knowledge, discussing life problems in relation to the spiritual life, saving the lost, upbuilding believers, and providing activity for believers.[29] *The Handbook for Young People's Bible Meeting Workers,* published in 1936, set forth these functions: to provide definite instruction in the Word of God, to build and develop character, to develop and exercise spiritual life, to participate in the privileges of personal Christian testimony, to develop and train talent, to create interest in the church, to train in reverence and to familiarize with worship, to provide actual Christian service, and to hold youth for Christ and the Church.

The functions of the Young People's Bible Meeting seemed to have enlarged as the movement matured. At first, its chief function was that of Bible study, as groups of young people reviewed the com-

[27] H. Frank Reist, "The Object and Value of the Young People's Bible Meeting," *Christian Monitor,* VI (September, 1914), 678.

[28] C. F. Derstine, "The Young People's Meeting Objectives," *Yearbook and Directory,* 1925, 27.

[29] Miller, *op. cit.,* 23-25.

ing Sunday's school lesson. Later, the emphasis in Young People's Meetings was that of training Christian character. Today, the primary function of the Young People's Bible Meetings, as suggested in the more recent lists of purposes, seems to be that of Christian training for Christian service.

The problem of organization. One of the earlier methods of organizing a Young People's Bible Meeting was for a minister or layman to select a Bible topic and by means of outlines and references cover the teaching of the Scripture on that subject. Another method was for the leader to teach from a portion of Scripture similar to the teaching in the Sunday school class. The most popular method, however, was the appointment of a committee to select topics and to assign these topics to a certain number of speakers.[30]

The latter method immediately presented a series of problems: How should the committee be appointed? How should programs be planned? How should suitable speakers be found?

There was no set pattern for the appointment of program committees. In many eastern churches the program committee was appointed by the ministers of the congregation. In the west the committeemen were elected by the congregation. Some committees served for a quarter, others for a year, and others for longer periods.[31] Many congregations organized their Young People's Bible Meetings under constitutions.

To help the local committees plan a well-rounded Young People's Bible Meeting, the Young People's Bible Meeting Topics Committee of General Conference, in addition to planning program materials, prepared a set of standards for Young People's Meetings:

> For several years past we have been forming a list of Standards for the Young People's Meeting, which is to serve as a guide to the various organizations in setting a goal toward which to labor in their work. These standards as they have been revised to date are published in the Young People's Meeting Topic Booklet and are as follows:
>
> (1) Adequate organization to carry on the work.
> (2) Accurate records of duties performed.
> (3) Instructive programs for both saved and unsaved.
> (4) Continual growth in Christian character.
> (5) Scriptural social standards.
> (6) More proficient and spiritual song services.
> (7) Greater activity in all lines of Christian service.
> (8) Fuller consecration to Christ.
> (9) Systematic and regular Bible study.
> (10) Co-operation with the Church, Sunday School, and home.[32]

[30] From Minutes of Young People's Bible Meeting Topics Committee, May 25, 1934.
[31] Miller, *op. cit.*, 25.
[32] General Conference Proceedings, Hesston, Kansas, 1933, 24.

The method of finding speakers for Young People's Meeting has been and continues to be a pressing problem. This question involves the problem of getting inexperienced young people started in the preparation of a message; it involves the problem of keeping up interest in the face of tedious talks; of keeping the Young People's Bible Meeting from becoming an adult meeting; of helping young people who lack sufficient Bible training to prepare a presentable talk on assigned topics; of distributing assignments among the capable and otherwise without endangering the value of the meeting, etc. To date the local congregation or planning committee has received little help in meeting these difficult problems. In addition to an occasional article in the *Gospel Herald* or *Christian Monitor*, the only material prepared to come to grips with some of these problems was the *Handbook for Young People's Bible Meeting Workers*. This *Handbook* was prepared in 1936 by a subcommittee of Young People's Bible Meeting Topics Committee: J. L. Horst, J. C. Fretz, and J. R. Mumaw. At present, this pamphlet is out of print.

In spite of the many perplexing problems, the Young People's Bible Meeting has continued to grow. From the eighty Young People's Bible Meetings in 1914 the number had grown to 166 by 1918. In 1924 there were 190 Young People's Meetings, by 1935 there were 207,[33] and by 1949 there were over 210 Young People's Bible Meetings.

III. Young People's Bible Meeting Curriculum Development

Early materials. In many of the early Young People's Meetings the Sunday school lesson for the following Sunday served as the program of study. In others portions of Scripture were selected at random and studied. Some Young People's Meetings followed the Christian Endeavor topics and outlines. A few groups prepared their own series of programs for a quarter or a year. In many cases the Young People's Meeting programs lacked careful preparation, and hence failed to accomplish the ends sought. Not only was there a lack of uniformity in the methods of conducting Young People's Meetings, but also it was clear that another of the difficulties of the early Young People's Meetings was the lack of carefully selected subjects accompanied by hints and suggestions for study and presentation.[34]

[33] Minutes of the General Sunday School Committee.
[34] *Herald of Truth*, XLIII (December 20, 1906), 481.

The *Young People's Paper* (1894-1906) published topics carefully selected from the Christian Endeavor lists. This reaching out for helps from non-Mennonite sources brought certain leaders to consider the preparation of Young People's Meeting helps, based on Mennonite doctrines, which would guide and conserve the thinking of Mennonite youth.

The Herald of Truth helps. Some half dozen brethren studied the problem of materials for Young People's Meetings and outlined a plan whereby topics for study in Young People's Meetings would appear in the pages of the *Herald of Truth.* The first topics appeared in the December 27, 1906, issue of the *Herald,* in a special "Young People's Bible Meeting Page." The first printed topic was for January 6, 1907, published a "week or more ahead so that the leader will have ample time to assign the work."[35]

The program materials for each week contained a lesson motto, a meditation, illustrations, quotations, personal thoughts, suggestions for the leader, daily readings, Bible hints, Bible lesson, and questions with references. The response to the *Herald of Truth's* topics was very favorable.

> We are glad for the favorable comment on the addition of the Young People's Bible Meeting Page. Those who wish the course for the entire year should write to A. B. Rutt. . . . The course is being printed in a neat folder, suitable to carry in the Bible or pocket.[36]

When the *Herald of Truth* was merged with the *Gospel Witness* to form the new church organ, the *Gospel Herald,* in 1908, the *Gospel Herald* continued the *Herald of Truth* feature of providing Young People's Bible Meeting topics and helps. The topics which appeared in the *Gospel Herald* were selected by the publishing staff at Scottdale. Topics were outlined for a year at a time and small cards were printed listing the topics for the year. The materials in the *Gospel Herald* were supplementary helps. These helps contained a lesson motto, Bible lights, a suggested program, hints to leaders and others, illustrations, and practical applications. Complete helps for Young People's Bible Meeting topics appeared in the *Gospel Herald* until December 12, 1908. After that they were published in the *Christian Monitor.*

The *Christian Monitor,* a thirty-two page magazine designed for the home and to build up young people, was first published in January 1909. The first general editor, H. Frank Reist (1909-19),

[35] *Loc. cit.*
[36] *Herald of Truth,* XLIV (January 1, 1907), 1.

was followed by Vernon Smucker (1920-23), C. F. Derstine (1923-28), and J. L. Horst, the present editor. The magazine contained numerous departments, such as Christian Life, Missions, Bible Study, Young People's Meeting, Educational, and Current Events. Each department had an editor. The Publication Board appointed J. D. Charles as topics editor of the Young People's Bible Meeting department. He, along with the general editor, prepared the Young People's Meeting topics which appeared in the *Monitor*.

The work of the Topics Committee. In 1909 the General Conference at West Liberty, Ohio, took an action which brought the task of topic planning under the control of the Church at large:

> It was moved and carried that this conference appoint a committee of five including the Editor of the Christian Monitor and the Editor of the Young People's Meeting department of the same, to select and arrange Young People's Meeting Topics for 1912 and 1913.[37]

Because J. D. Charles was unable to continue to serve as topic editor of the Young People's Department, J. R. Shank was appointed to serve in his place. Shank's first service was rendered in 1910; his first outlines and discussions appeared in the *Christian Monitor* of February 1910. Since that time Shank has been the pivotal figure in the development of the Young People's Bible Meeting curriculum. For over thirty years he prepared topics and helps for Young People's Meetings.

The Topics Committee of five, which included the topics editor and editor of the *Monitor,* was appointed at each session of General Conference from 1909 until the sessions at Belleville, Pennsylvania, in 1939.[38] At this conference no committee was appointed due to the plan adopted by General Conference at Turner, Oregon, in 1937, in which the service of the Topics Committee was to be rendered by the newly organized Commission for Christian Education and Young People's Work.

In the original plan the Topics Committee was to report its work to General Conference for review and approval. However, in 1911, General Conference approved the recommendation of the committee:

> That instead of preparing two years' work in advance and reporting directly to this conference as heretofore; that the topics be arranged annually and be submitted to the Publishing Committee for approval.

[37] *Proceedings of the Mennonite General Conference* (Scottdale: Mennonite Publishing House, 1921), 132.

[38] J. R. Shank, "Young People's Bible Meeting," *Mennonite Yearbook and Directory,* 1940, 19.

On motion the recommendation of the committee was made the order from the conference.[39]

Until 1922 the topics which were arranged by the Committee were printed annually on small cards. Except for Scripture references, also printed on the cards, all of the supplemental materials were found in the *Christian Monitor*. Then in 1921 in response to numerous requests and in consultation with the Publishing Committee, it was decided to publish the topics for 1922, together with the Scripture outlines and suggestive assignments in booklet form for the entire year in advance. This was for the convenience of superintendents, leaders, and committees who desired to make out programs for more than a month in advance and yet wished to use the outlines and suggestive assignments which appeared in the *Christian Monitor*. The material in the booklets appeared in the *Monitor* also. However, the helps in the *Monitor* were more extensive than those in the booklets.

As the years went by the Topics Committee attempted to select topics in such a way that every area of Christian living was studied at regular intervals. The Committee attempted to work out a cycle whereby the major portions of the Bible were systematically studied. Each year there were lessons dealing with the Christian life, consecration, missions, doctrines of the Bible, social problems, education, the Bible itself, and seasonal activities. The Topics Committee also provided a Junior Bible Meeting topic for each month.

The work of the Commission. When the Mennonite Commission for Christian Education and Young People's Work took over the work of the Topics Committee in 1937, no changes were made in Young People's Meeting materials. The *Topics Booklet*, for all practical purposes, was identical with the first one published in 1922. The *Christian Monitor* was still the main source of additional helps. It was not until 1943 that steps were taken to revitalize the Young People's Bible Meeting. In 1943 the Curriculums Committee took action:

That the committee approve the general plans for revitalizing the young people's meeting, including the publication of a topics quarterly to take the place of the present annual YPBM topics booklet.[40]

In the next two years the Curriculums Committee spent much time planning the new Young People's Bible Meeting topics booklet. In 1944 the name *Program Builder* was approved as the title

[39] *Proceedings of the Mennonite General Conference, op. cit.*, 147.
[40] Minutes of the Curriculums Committee, October 7, 8, 1943.

of the new booklet. By 1945 the content of the *Program Builder* was well defined. Each topic was to be organized under four major divisions: "Introduction," which contained the purpose and the gist of the topic; "For the Speakers," which contained an outline for study, questions for study, and source materials: "For the Committee," which gave suggestions for planning the program and suggested assignments; and "For the Leader," which contained suggestions for procedure and the devotional period.[41]

The first issue of the *Program Builder* appeared in 1945. In explaining the new booklet to the Church, J. R. Mumaw, Field Secretary of the Commission, wrote:

> Considerable time and energy have been spent in the revision of the Young People's Bible Meeting Booklet. This has been set up in a 96-page publication to appear semiannually under the title *Program Builder*. This booklet now includes suggestions for the leader and for the program committee as well as a gist of the topic for all who are associated in any way with the program. We have added also a list of questions that are intended to serve as study questions in the preparation of the topics. With each topic we have provided an alternative program which is intended to provide greater variety in the kind of meetings that can be sponsored. . . .[42]

At first, the *Builder* was published seminannually. At present it is a quarterly. The suggested alternative programs for the weekly topics were not so much a variation of materials as variation of method. In the alternative programs, panel discussions, testimony meetings, or lectures are encouraged.

In 1946 the Young People's Topics Committee of the Commission, in endeavoring to discover what studies would contribute most toward developing in Mennonite youth an appreciation of the Christian life and an appreciation of the Biblical principles of the Mennonite Church came to the conclusion that the two goals, adequate doctrinal studies and desired outcomes, should be the guide in preparing a cycle of topics.

Accordingly, the Committee first listed the basic doctrines of the Scriptures and then set about to determine what the practical outcome of believing these doctrines would be. Following this principle, the Topics Committee prepared a five-year cycle of topics. The first of the new series of topics appeared in the *Program Builder* in the first quarter of 1949.

[41] Minutes of Curriculums Committee, March 23, 24, 1945.

[42] John R. Mumaw, Commission Report, *Mennonite Yearbook and Directory*, 1945, *op. cit.*, 16.

The preparation of the topic cycle is the most recent advance in the development of Young People's Bible Meeting curriculum materials.

Junior Bible Meeting Materials. Since the Young People's Meeting was designed for the whole family, provision was made in many congregations for teaching children in the Sunday evening services. Through the years "Children's Meetings" and "Junior Programs" have been a part of the Young People's Bible Meeting program. Sometimes these meetings were conducted in the early minutes of the Young People's Meeting with the young people and adults listening in. Sometimes they were conducted in another part of the building simultaneously with the Young People's Bible Meeting. The old Topics Committee of General Conference prepared a monthly topic for Junior Meetings.

In recent years much emphasis has been placed on Junior Bible Meeting; however, it was not until 1943 that the work of the Junior Bible Meeting was clearly defined. The Curriculums Committee outlined the work of the Junior Meeting as follows:

a. The junior meeting shall include all children up to and including intermediates, who shall assemble in a separate meeting during the time of the regular young people's meeting.

b. It shall be supervised by an adult committee elected by the congregation (or any other authorized method) who shall be responsible for the arrangement of the programs and for the conducting of the meetings.

c. It shall be primarily an expressional activity in which the children participate both in rendition of the program features suitable to their age and in leadership of meetings in which the junior can function satisfactorily, such as moderator, song leader, devotional leader, etc.

d. Its program shall vary in type, in subject matter, in procedure and in leadership.

e. Its materials shall appear in a quarterly for this and other related purposes.[43]

The *Program Builder,* the Young People's Bible Meeting topics quarterly, carries a department which contains weekly programs for Junior Bible Meetings. This department also suggests methods of administering programs and lists sources from which those taking part in the Junior Programs can draw their materials.

The beginnings, growth, and development of the Mennonite Young People's Meeting have been considered. Perhaps at the close it might be well to list in a brief way a few of the contributions of the Young People's Meeting to the life of the Church. In the first place the Young People's Meeting encouraged expressional activity.

[43] Minutes of the Curriculums Committee, October 28, 1943.

For the first time young people were permitted to take part in public services. They learned how to pray in public; they learned how to speak in public; and they learned how to give an expression of their faith in an audible way. In the second place, the Young People's Meeting has increased Bible knowledge and kept the teachings and program of the Mennonite Church before Mennonite youth. The selected topics that were studied in the Young People's Meetings through the years emphasized not only the basic doctrine of the Christian faith, but also the distinctly Mennonite doctrines. Further, there was a constant emphasis on service and missions. In the third place, the Young People's Meeting served as a steppingstone in the lives of many young persons to places of greater service for Christ. In the Young People's Meeting many received their first taste of Christian service. Through preparation of topic discussions many were brought to think clearly for the first time about the meaning of Christianity and its demands on life. Then, too, many young persons who served effectively in the Young People's Meeting were called to positions of responsibility as their consecration and abilities were recognized. The Young People's Bible Meeting has developed character, instilled conviction, promoted missions, and increased denominational loyalty among Mennonite youth.[44]

[44] For a brief summary of the Young People's Meeting movement, see H. S. Bender's *Mennonite Sunday School Centennial, 1840-1940* (Scottdale, 1940), 57, 58.

MENNONITES IN LYON COUNTY, KANSAS: 1880-90: A MEMOIR

JOHN UMBLE

During the early eighties Amish Mennonite families from the East with a few from Iowa founded a settlement in Lyon County, Kansas, in the vicinity of Hartford. After a precarious existence of several decades it disappeared entirely. Nothing of the colony now remains except the memory of a few of the families and a deserted little cemetery several miles west of Hartford, formerly known as the Borntreger graveyard.

A few Amish settlers had moved to the eastern part of Lyon County near Hartford just across the Coffee County line probably as early as 1880. In 1883 Isaac Stoltzfus, a member of the Union County, Pennsylvania, Amish congregation, moved into the neighborhood and became interested in promoting the sale of real estate among his former Union County relatives and friends. In the Union County congregation considerable dissatisfaction had arisen on account of certain neighborhood quarrels which eventually led to the silencing of Bishop Elias Riehl, who then united with the Mennonite Church in Juniata County.

The death of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus and three of his sons about 1880 hastened the dissolution of the congregation.[1] One of the ministers, Christian King, a son-in-law of Christian Stoltzfus, returned to Lancaster County from which the Stoltzfus family and others had come in 1838. In Lancaster County, King was ordained a bishop in the Old Order Amish Church. Isaac Stoltzfus, one of Christian's sons, co-operating with certain real estate interests in Kansas and the railroad companies, promoted a free land inspection tour for a number of his relatives and friends from Union County, Pennsylvania, and from Champaign County, Ohio, in 1884. The group visited Kansas in June when Kansas corn already was several feet high at the time it was barely through the ground in Union County. The entire group was fascinated by the richness of the soil, the beauty of the growing crops, the cloudless skies of "sunny Kansas," and the luxuriant growth of grass on the unfenced prairie promising cheap pasture for horses and cattle.

B. F. Umble, the husband of one of the Stoltzfus sisters, who remained in Union County while his wife made the tour to Kansas

[1] For an extended history of the Union County Amish settlement see *M.Q.R.*, VII: 71-96 and VII: 162-190.

with her brothers and sister and other relatives, strongly advised against investing in Kansas land. In 1879 he had worked as a hired man in Harvey and Reno counties. In that year a plague of grasshoppers destroyed the crops in Reno County. Some of the members of the community had planted potatoes by the mulching process, that is covering them with a light layer of soil and spreading a thick coat of straw or prairie hay over the ground to retain the moisture. The grasshoppers not only ate the tops but even followed the stems down into the straw and consumed the entire plant. In an adjoining county, in addition to the grasshoppers, the chinch bugs and the hot south winds from Oklahoma had ruined the corn crop. But what was the testimony of one person who had happened to be in Kansas in an "off year," compared to the actual sight of the fine prospects for corn in Lyon County!

The enthusiastic reports brought back East by the visitors to Kansas aroused keen interest not only in Union County,Pennsylvania, but also among some of their relatives and friends in Western Ohio. Preacher Moses Stutzman of West Liberty, Ohio, tried in every way to persuade his son-in-law, Jacob S. Kenagy, to join the western trek so as not to miss this golden opportunity to purchase the rich Kansas land before the in-rush of settlers would double or treble the price. He sharply criticized his son-in-law's failure to move to Kansas.

At the death of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus in 1883, each of his seventeen surviving children and the families of his deceased sons had inherited three thousand dollars, a large sum in those days. Most of those who moved to Kansas purchased a quarter section (160 acres), part of which was virgin prairie sod. Some bought improved land at a higher rate per acre and gave a mortgage for part of the purchase price.

Late in the winter of 1884-85 the Union County group chartered an "emigrant car" and left for Kansas, taking enough food with them for the trip. At Urbana, Ohio, by previous arrangement, the car was put on a siding, and the group went to Huntsville in Logan County in sleds and sleighs for the wedding of one of the members to his Logan County bride. Eli Stoltzfus, later an Ohio bishop, married Ella Yoder, daughter of Bishop and Mrs. Jonas C. Yoder. Stoltzfus had come to Kansas the summer before and had plowed a part of his quarter section so that it would be ready for planting when he arrived in the spring. It was customary in the early days to plow the stiff prairie sod to a very shallow depth to allow it to decompose until the next season before it could be pre-

pared for seeding. The soil was strongly alkaline so much so that here and there a spot would grow no vegetation of any kind.

The furniture that these families took with them to Kansas in the "emigrant outfit" would make a mid-twentieth-century dealer in antiques "turn green with envy." There were solid walnut bedsteads. There were eight-day grandfather clocks that not only struck the hour in beautiful chimes but also showed the phases of the moon. These were mounted in highly polished ornamental solid cherry cases over six feet tall. There were writing desks (secretaries), and bookcases, massively built, all of solid cherry. Then there were highboys, "bureaus," also of solid cherry, a few of solid walnut. There were also solid cherry drop leaf tables skillfully put together with butterfly mortices and dowel pins instead of screws and nails. There were also a large number of chests of various sizes and uses, most of them of solid walnut, or of cedar to repel moths. Some were intended for storing clothes and bedding, and some were "wood boxes" to be placed near the kitchen stove to hold the kindling or firewood.

The members of the Union County group included the widow and the following children of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus: Isaac K. Stoltzfus, already mentioned, and family; Jonathan Stoltzfus and family, who had moved to Brown County, Kansas, in 1883; the widow of Simeon Stoltzfus and her family; Mr. and Mrs. B. F. Umble (Nancy B. Stoltzfus) and two sons; Preacher and Mrs. David Stoltzfus (Lizzie B. Stoltzfus) and two daughters; Eli B. Stoltzfus and his recent bride; and the one remaining unmarried son of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus, Benjamin B. Stoltzfus. Later Benjamin married Emma Rich, a member of an Iowa family who had moved to a farm south of Hartford about 1870. They lived on a farm purchased by his widowed mother, Mrs. Lydia (Beiler) Stoltzfus. In 1951 Mrs. Emma (Rich) Stoltzfus, now a widow past eighty years old, gave the writer some of the facts about the Rich family and their Iowa friends.

The Pennsylvania group included Preacher Andrew Miller and family and his brother John O. Miller and family, as well as an unmarried sister-in-law of the Miller brothers, Rebecca Riehl, and an unmarried brother-in-law, Jonas Riehl, all from the Union County Amish settlement. The group was joined also by Jonathan J. Warye, of Urbana, Ohio, of the Hooley Amish Mennonite congregation in Champaign County. All of them purchased farms west of Hartford in Lyon County.

In the beginning they held church services in the Fairview schoolhouse about three miles west of Hartford and were served in the ministry by Andrew Miller and David Stoltzfus. They also met in some of the homes in the neighborhood, especially for counsel meeting and communion services. Bishop Joseph Schlegel, of Nebraska, served as bishop.

The community was joined in the early years by Joseph Stucky who married the widow of Simeon Stoltzfus. He had been ordained a deacon in the Amish Church but on account of certain alleged business irregularities, he was inactive most of the time.

The members of the congregation suffered a variety of vicissitudes. Coming from Pennsylvania and being accustomed to grain and stock farming, the new settlers planted corn and intended to feed cattle. Feeling certain that Kansas land would yield a good corn crop and wishing to put up the kind and type of building to which they had been accustomed in the East, the writer's parents built a large wagon shed and corncrib soon after moving to Kansas. The wagon shed had a corncrib on each side of the driveway. Neither corncrib was full of corn during the entire time that the family lived in Kansas, but during the last two years when there was something like half a crop of corn, one of the cribs was full and the other contained some corn. When the writer visited this farm in the early thirties, the corncrib and barn were in an extremely dilapidated condition; and, when he returned to the place in 1948, the once new beautiful building had disappeared entirely. The entire farm including garden, truck patch, and feed lot was sown to wheat.

During the first season (1885) after the corn was planted a severe flood ruined the prospects for a corn crop and left the families without a crop of any kind. During the next three years drought, hot winds, and chinch bugs ruined the corn crop. The settlers tried oats and even flax but the crop seldom was worth harvesting. Native prairie grass yielded a fair crop of hay, coarse and unpalatable, but nutritious.

What made it particularly hard for the families from the East was that they had been well-to-do. They had been hard-working frugal people, but they were accustomed to seeing some fruit for their labors. They had well-stocked cellars and smokehouses, and always a little ready money even for an occasional little luxury. They put up ice in winter and enjoyed many a freezerful of ice cream. Here in Kansas they had nothing but deprivation and hardship.

Each of the three lean dry years was the same. The early spring gave every promise of a good season for growing crops. The

farmers turned the rich black earth and planted their corn early. Each year Frank Umble planted more than half of his quarter section in corn. It grew very well, became a rich green color and the entire community would be congratulating itself on the prospects of a fine corn crop. Such corn never grew in Union County, Pennsylvania. Later in June as the corn was already tasseling and ready to shoot ears, a hot wind from the south swept across the plains of Texas and Oklahoma and the level sections of southern Kansas.

Each year the heat and wind continued for three days. The very air seemed thirsty. The wind, drawing the moisture from hand and face, seemed to shrivel the skin. The chickens remained under cover. Cattle grazed only at night. No one could work in the fields. The ground became so dry that huge cracks appeared in gardens and fields. Even wagon wheels sometimes became wedged in these large cracks. At the end of three days most of the corn tassels were burned white, leaving the fields with little prospects of a crop. The stalks, however, remained partly green and most of the settlers said, "We shall at least have fodder to winter our stock."

Then came the chinch bugs. They covered the ground. They covered the stalks of corn higher than the ear and sucked the juice from the stalk—literally killing whole fields. One year more than eighty acres planted by Frank Umble did not yield a wagon bed full of corn (nubbins).

Still hopeful, he cut a large amount of the fodder and placed it in shock, according to good Pennsylvania practice, expecting to winter his stock on the fodder. He had purchased fourteen head of calves and branded them and turned them out on the open range to graze during the summer. In the fall when he rounded them up down on Eagle Creek several miles away, they were in fair condition. He placed them in the feed lot and began to feed fodder out of the shock. They did not thrive. Finally one died. He consulted a veterinarian. After the veterinarian had examined the dead animal he turned to Umble and said, "This steer died of starvation." The reply was, "Impossible, he gets all the fodder he can eat and plenty of water." "But," said the veterinarian, "the chinch bugs took all of the nutriment out of this fodder last summer. You might as well feed sawdust. Unless you supplement this roughage with grain, all of your cattle will die." Umble purchased corn at a dollar a bushel to keep the remaining cattle alive until spring.

This was an example of what happened to the entire community for three years in succession. The farmers plowed the fields in the fall and since the Kansas climate permitted early planting, they

would plant corn in early spring. Then they would see the corn thrive until after it tasseled. But every year there would be a repetition of the same sad story—hot winds, burning sun, shriveled tassels, no ears or only very imperfect ones, and chinch bugs that made even the fodder unpalatable to the cattle because after they had sucked the juices from the corn they crawled between the stalk and the shank of the leaf and died there. Even the cold of winter did not destroy the sickening odor of the chinch bug.

S. E. Allgyer, brother-in-law of Frank Umble, although he never had seriously considered moving to Kansas, made a visit to Lyon County about 1886. He states that he never saw a more desolate, discouraging prospect.[2] The heat was intense. Even the strong wind gave no relief from the heat. Even at night the air was stifling. Chickens and farm animals sought in vain for a less torrid spot. The brilliant sun and scorched air literally dried up all vegetation.

A number of families left through those lean years. The Andrew Miller family moved to Missouri after Mrs. Miller died. John O. Miller moved to Herrington, Kansas. The J. J. Waryes returned to Ohio. During the first summer (1885) on account of his wife's homesickness Eli Stoltzfus sent her home to Ohio for a visit to her parents. He tried to do his own cooking but he told his brother, "Honest, Ben, my cooking makes me sick." Before her return to Kansas he joined her in Logan County and she never saw Kansas again. Stoltzfus simply surrendered his farm to the holder of the mortgage and left. The young couple was very poor. During the first winter after their return to Ohio, Stoltzfus sawed, cut, and split wood for a neighbor at fifty cents a cord. They had no money and lived on corn meal mush—boiled in the evening and fried for breakfast. He took cold fried mush with him to the woods for his noon meal. Sometimes it was partly frozen in the dinner pail. Finally they had no lard to fry the mush. But mush without lard lacked something. So Stoltzfus went to a farm sale, bought a big fat hog for fifteen dollars, gave a note in payment, butchered the hog, sold the meat to pay the note, and his wife used the lard to fry mush.

A few families who had a little more money stayed on in Kansas for several more years. Frank Umble and family did not leave until 1890; Preacher David Stoltzfus and family partly out of loyalty to the congregation, not until the year following. During the last two years, Umble had somewhat more than half a crop of corn.

[2] Personal interview in 1951.

When he decided to leave, some of his Yankee neighbors thought he was very foolish because crops were so much better and because he was able to reduce the mortgage still due on his land. His reply was, "I am going back East while I am able. A few more years of drought would make it impossible for me to return."

He chartered a freight car, loaded two western horses, a few cows, his implements, household furniture, and part of his 1890 corn crop in the car and returned to West Liberty, Ohio. He accompanied the freight car, partly to take care of the stock and partly to save passenger fare to Ohio. The story of that trip, the difficulties in watering and caring for the stock, and finally the necessity of changing the trucks on the freight car because the rails on the western lines were farther apart than those in the East—all this is a saga in itself.

His family left by train. He rented the Kansas farm to a Whitaker family, the grandparents of the present Glen Whitaker, of Thurman, Colorado. He was unable to sell the farm and for a number of years the income from the one hundred sixty acres did not pay the interest on the fifteen hundred dollar mortgage still due on the farm. Later they sold the farm for the amount of the mortgage, happy to be rid at last of their Kansas land.

In the fall of 1890 before the Umble family left, four neighbors, including a Stutzman family, the Umbles, and possibly a Gingerich family had a farm sale to dispose of their surplus stock and part of their farm implements. The sale was held at the home of a certain Stutzman family living in the southern part of the settlement. Jonathan Stoltzfus, father of Preacher Ammon Stoltzfus, loaded his few belongings on a wagon and moved to Brown County, later to Nebraska.

Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin B. Stoltzfus left the Hartford community near the end of the century. They had a sale and disposed of most of their property, intending to move to Oklahoma to take up a claim.[3] First, however, they visited Mrs. Stoltzfus' relatives in Iowa and Mr. Stoltzfus' relatives in Ohio in the vicinity of West Liberty. When they visited the latter place the relatives said, "You should stay here instead of taking your family to a wild country like Oklahoma." They rented a farm near Huntsville and later moved to the vicinity of West Liberty where they purchased a farm and united with the Bethel Mennonite Church. Benjamin Stoltzfus was ordained to the ministry, served faithfully for a number of years

[3] Personal interview in 1951.

and then moved to Lima with his family, serving as superintendent of the Lima Mennonite Mission. The family lived there until the death of Mr. Stoltzfus. Mrs. Stoltzfus now resides in her own home in West Liberty.

Although a number of other Mennonite families moved into the community later, the congregation never built a meetinghouse. One of the members named Schlegel was ordained to the ministry but he also moved away later. Another family were the Steckleys. Eli Kauffman married one of the Steckley girls; Daniel Kauffman married Mary Steckley. John Suter married the eldest girl in the Steckley family. They lived on the Isaac Stoltzfus farm for a time. The Whitakers moved into the settlement about 1890 and occupied the Frank Umble farm when the Umbles left for Ohio.

The writer recalls one meeting at the Fairview schoolhouse when the congregation chose candidates for the ministry. The air was tense with emotion. A few women wept. None of the members were Bible students. None could speak in public. Services were in German and although they carried on the simple conversation of the farm and fireside in Pennsylvania Dutch, it would be quite another matter to preach and pray in the German language. But their baptismal vows had included the promise that if they were chosen for the ministry they would accept the responsibility of reading and preaching the Word in the public worship service. All members, men and women, in secret council, told the ministers whom they preferred to have ordained as minister. As soon as the names of the candidates were announced their families and even some of the candidates themselves wept. Some wept loudly and uncontrollably.[4] The faces of those candidates who did not weep were drawn and tense. The writer's father was among the candidates. He did not weep, but he was very serious. Mother, however, was convulsed with weeping. As soon as the family was in the spring wagon ready to go home, Father rebuked her sternly and commanded her to "quit crying," adding something like the following: "Just being chosen for the lot does not mean that the lot will hit me. It won't. I am not called to preach. I was in the lot in Union County. It did not hit me then. It won't hit me this time. So control yourself and quit crying." Although his voice sounded harsh, his intention was kind

[4] This was not an unusual occurrence in connection with an Amish ordination. In fact it was, and still is, the rule. It may hark back to the European period when ordination meant certain persecution and possible banishment or even death to an Anabaptist known to have been ordained to the ministry. It probably also expressed the sympathy of the congregation for one on whom the heavy responsibilities of the ministry were about to be imposed. Like some other centuries-old Amish practices it has become a custom that is almost a necessary part of a given occasion.

for he knew that violent emotion would give her one of those terrible "Sunday headaches" causing her to vomit her dinner and go to bed practically helpless with pain until far into the night. On those occasions nothing would ease the pain except cold towels laid on her forehead and temples.

The ordination took place some time after the candidates were selected, probably several Sundays later. This may have been the occasion when John Whitaker was chosen by lot and ordained to the ministry. He never preached.

In the early thirties when the writer returned to his boyhood home in Kansas, the buildings on the old home place were in a rather dilapidated condition but the entire farm, including what had formerly been the large peach and apple orchard and the feed lot, was sowed to wheat. The crop was just ripening and it was estimated that it would produce between twelve and fifteen bushels per acre. Such a crop would have paid for the land in the late eighties and left a neat bank account beside.

A few of the settlers from the east had tried to raise winter wheat but that, too, was a failure. For two successive years Frank Umble experimented with ten acres of wheat on a piece of higher ground lying in the northwest corner of his farm. But apparently they knew nothing of the hard wheat that has since made Kansas one of the principal granaries of the United States.

In later years some of the settlers who had left Lyon County, Kansas, told of some of the hardships they had endured during those four lean years. None of them had a woodlot for fuel. A Yankee neighbor, Osborn, who had several sections of land including some wooded land along the river, offered to let them cut wood on the shares. A number of the Amish Mennonites co-operated in sawing down trees and sawing and splitting the wood. When the time came to divide it, the Yankee kept all the wood from the more desirable logs and demanded that the group take cottonwood and other soft woods for their fuel. This wood had almost no heat value.

Some of them then worked with a team in a strip coal mine ten or fifteen miles north of Hartford in the vicinity of Lebo in order to secure some coal for fuel. They were paid fifty cents a day, required to board themselves and furnish feed for their team. At the end of each week's work they brought home a pitifully small load of coal. During the time that the writer's father was working in the coal mine, the mother used a three horse team to plow forty acres of ground for corn the next spring. She curried, harnessed, and cared for the team alone during that entire period. During the pre-

ceding winter she had lost two little boys by death during the Christmas season and an infant son in March. She preferred to work and to work hard in order to retain her mental health. During part of that summer there was no fuel to cook the meals. She sent the writer out on the range with a basket to gather "cow chips" (the dried droppings of cattle) to use in cooking the meager supply of corn meal mush. The chips burned like tinder but with an intense heat. The odor of the burning fuel was rather unpleasant.

Another hardship suffered by the families in the Hartford settlement was sickness. In the winter of 1888 the scourge of flu, then called la grippe, swept the community. Although there were few deaths, many people were desperately ill and were in a weakened condition for months following the epidemic. The writer was ill for three days. Those three days marked his first absence from school during his first three years. Two families lost children ill with diphtheria, then known as membraneous croup. In those days medical science knew no cure for this scourge of the children. The physician had no consolation for the distressed parents except to describe in a rather heartless fashion how the membrane would grow in the windpipe until it finally closed the air passage, choking the child to death. The writer was present at the death of one of these little ones and vividly recalls the terrible distress of the parents. They lost three of their children in one winter. All three, the writer's brothers, now lie in the lonely little cemetery several miles west of Hartford. A two-year-old cousin of these three died of "cholera infantum" one summer and is buried in the same cemetery.

Father and Mother had decided to go to Kansas to bring the remains of their three children to Ohio and reinter them in the Hooley cemetery in Champaign County as soon as they had made the last payment on their farm and had helped their neighbors to finish threshing. Less than a month after Father had made the last payment on the farm, he was killed instantly in front of the home of a neighbor as he drove his wagon across the trolley tracks where he was helping to thresh. The three little bodies still lie in the cemetery west of Hartford. It was not too well kept when the writer visited the spot in 1949.

Typhoid fever also took its toll. Preacher John King and his family moved to Hartford in Lyon County from Logan County, Ohio, and bought a tract of land in Coffee County south of the settlement on what was known as Eagle Creek, southeast of Hartford. Bishop King had sold his property in Logan County, Ohio, and had come to Lyon County in order to provide each of his sons with a

farm. After he and his sons had erected two houses on the tract, a land company in Emporia, the county seat, came to take possession of the land. It developed that they had held an unrecorded mortgage on the tract for eighteen thousand dollars. King had no other course except to leave the land in the hands of the holders of the mortgage. This meant losing all his property and the small amount that his sons had accumulated. Partially as a result of anxiety over the loss of his property, he became ill and died from typhoid fever in January, 1888. He was buried on a bitter cold day when the temperature was forty degrees below zero. The writer's father had the only new spring wagon in the community and was always called on to convey the casket to the cemetery when there was a funeral. The writer remembers vividly seeing his father, wrapped in a robe made of the skin of a buffalo, drive away on that bitter cold morning in a blizzard with two horses hitched to the spring wagon.

The hot weather in summer was hard on stock and animals as well as people. One hot day after a terrific struggle a farmer's dog killed a skunk. The dog was almost prostrated by the heat. A few days later, as the farmer was coming out of the house, the dog snapped at him savagely. Fearing hydrophobia, the farmer tied the dog. Every time anyone would approach him, the dog would attempt to bite. On being reproved, he would go back and lie down but only for a few seconds when he would again attempt to break his chain. The dog had to be killed. On another occasion a dentist from Emporia was driving toward Hartford accompanied by his prize bloodhound. The bloodhound started after a jack rabbit and later it was estimated that he had chased him for about three miles. The jack rabbit escaped, but the dog died of heat prostration. The writer never saw but one jack rabbit overtaken by a dog. And that one proved to be a female heavy with young.

But not all was sadness or hardship. The country was very beautiful in the springtime. Early in the spring the prairies were covered with flowers resembling the dogtooth violet and called "Easter lilies" by the people of the locality. The school children gathered these flowers by handfuls and took them to the schoolroom or brought them home. The springtime was a time of great beauty. The black soil produced grass and early garden crops in great profusion. In one of the better seasons some of the families planted peanuts and produced quite a crop. The writer remembers as a boy selling a considerable quantity of these peanuts at his father's final disposal sale and receiving five cents a glass for them. This was in the fall of 1890 after one of the two "good years."

There was the church service every other Sunday with its singing; its worship service was always appreciated even though one of the ministers had only two sermons which he alternated with great regularity. But since there were several ministers and church services were held only every other Sunday, there was a long enough interval between the sermons so that the congregation found something new and interesting in them when they heard them repeated once more. The congregation always looked forward to services conducted by visiting ministers. Especially beloved were Preacher David Zook, of Harvey County, and Bishop Joseph Schlegel, of Nebraska. Zook's sermons had a warm evangelistic note that appealed even to an eight-year-old boy. "Joe" Schlegel had an interesting sermon and his kind jovial disposition endeared him to the hearts of the people.

All the services were conducted in German with possibly a considerable sprinkling of Pennsylvania "Dutch." The hymnbook was the "Allegemeine Liedersammlung." But to many of the members the singing was unsatisfactory, too slow, and the tunes too old or too difficult. The writer remembers hearing his parents discuss the singing. Finally Mother persuaded Father to lead a hymn sung to a popular secular tune. Father could not sing; Mother could. But women did not lead hymns in church. However, when Father started the hymn on the next Sunday Mother gave him such good support that the singing was a "success." The writer was too young to note anything odd about it at the time and for once joined in the hymn. But he has since wondered what the congregation thought when Father started the hymn to the tune "There'll be somebody waiting, waiting, There'll be somebody waiting for me." At any rate the congregation sang all the stanzas of the hymn.

Naturally, since he was under ten at the time and since the counsel meetings of the congregation were open only to its baptized members, the writer may not be in a position to speak authoritatively about church government and discipline. But, probably because the group came from a rather conservative Amish Mennonite background, little attention seems to have been given to such matters as dress. The western frontier settlements seem to have allowed more freedom in such matters. To the church service the women wore a large plain stiff bonnet with an attached short cape at the neck and under it the rather large neatly starched and ironed devotional covering. The writer does not recall that any of the women of the congregation except his grandmother wore this covering at any time except on Sunday. She may have worn it constantly because she had a

bald spot at the top of the back of her head. Instead of a coat the women wore over their shoulders a large black shawl folded into a triangle.

The men wore a regular business suit. The writer recalls that his father owned a hook and eye vest, probably brought from Pennsylvania, but he does not remember that it was used for any special purpose or occasion. Most of the clothing not only for women and children but also for men was home made. Amish Mennonite mothers were neat seamstresses.

Mother never removed the plain band gold wedding ring from her finger until it grew too small. Then she needed help in removing it but took it to a jeweler to have it enlarged. She continued to wear it for some years after the family moved to Ohio. Then, in consequence of Bible Conference teaching on the "wearing of gold," she removed it and never wore it again. She also owned and sometimes wore in Kansas heavy plain solid gold loop earrings suspended from holes in the lobe of the ear. It seems that piercing the lobe of the ear and wearing earrings was supposed to be a deterrent to attacks of headache!

Then there was the Sunday visiting when old and young met together for dinner at a neighbor's home, the older people recalling brighter days and planning for the future while the boys and girls played on the lawn or about the buildings of the farm home.

Then, too, there were the two special holidays, Christmas and Fourth of July. The writer was past ten years old before he knew that Santa Claus was a myth. To the Amish Mennonite families of the Hartford community he was Grischt Kindli, the "little Christ Child" who brought to all "good" little boys and girls gifts of candy and nuts on Christmas eve. The children set a plate on the kitchen table before retiring. The next morning the plate contained a few pieces of candy, some nuts, and the one orange of the entire year.

On at least one occasion "Belz Nickle" visited the writer's home on New Year's Eve. He wore a huge beard and great coat and carried a bundle of switches as well as nuts and candy. On leaving, after a searching inquiry whether everyone in the home had been "good" during the past year, he took the switches with him when he left but distributed a few pieces of candy and some nuts.

Fourth of July never passed without its bunch of firecrackers—just one five-cent package. To derive the full measure of delight from them the family waited until dark to light them and then

only one at a time. Except for this, the Fourth was merely another work day.

As time went on and the children grew nearer the age for "joining church," parents became more conscious of the need for a strong church life. One summer the group decided to organize a Sunday school. The writer remembers driving a number of miles south with his parents to a schoolhouse where a Sunday school was organized. None of the members of the congregation had ever taken part in Sunday school. Few, if any, families had family worship. Hence, when nominations were made for superintendent each one in turn refused to serve. Finally the group elected as superintendent Jonas Riehl, a young man who was a diligent Bible student but who was not a member of the church. The writer recalls hearing his father say as the family was driving home that afternoon, "Here we have wanted a Sunday school for a number of years and now that we have at last organized one, we have an infidel for a superintendent." To be sure he was not an infidel, but under these circumstances the Sunday school did not flourish. So far as the writer knows, none of his relatives ever attended Sunday school in Lyon County after that.

Naturally, there were other Christians in the community who were Germans or of German background. Daniel Rich, whose wife was a Widmer, had moved south of Hartford from Wayland, Iowa, about 1870 with their family of three boys and three girls. Mrs. Rich spoke German but could speak French with equal fluency. One daughter, Emma, now the widow of the late Benjamin B. Stoltzfus and living at West Liberty, Ohio, remembers seeing mail at Hartford dated in 1871. She was five years old when the family moved to Hartford. Daniel Rich had been a renter in Iowa and drove two big wagons to Kansas because as he said, he knew that he never could purchase a farm in Iowa. In Kansas he was able to buy eighty acres. This Daniel Rich and his wife were relatives of the late Bishop Eli Frey of Fulton County, Ohio, and also of the Daniel Graber family near Noble, Iowa. Rev. Benjamin Eicher, founder of the General Conference Mennonite Church at Wayland, was a brother-in-law of Daniel Rich. Mrs. Stoltzfus told the writer in 1951 that Benjamin Eicher brought at least three groups over from Germany. Some remained in Wayne County, Ohio; others went to Iowa. On account of their connection with Benjamin Eicher, it was natural that the Rich family should lean toward the General Conference group. They did not attend church services at the Fairview schoolhouse but conducted a Sunday school at the Fleming schoolhouse south of

Hartford. John Hoch was superintendent for a time. John Rich was an older brother of Daniel Rich. Both had sons named Daniel and several of these Daniels are buried in the Hartford Cemetery. Some of the group who worshiped with the Rich family were Evangelicals who also had come from Iowa.

Among these Evangelicals who worshiped with the General Conference group were Philip Mann, Andrew Duttweiler whose wife was a Mann; and John Hoch with his three sons, Jacob, John, and Philip. All of these people or their children attended the Rich Sunday school in the Fleming schoolhouse. All of them were German or German-French and in the early years, conducted their services in German.

This group never had a minister but the Russian Mennonite ministers used to hold services for them en route from Wood County to Hillsboro. Rev. David Dyck would stop at the Daniel Rich home and preach for the group on Friday night. Then, after staying overnight, he would go on to Hillsboro to hold services, stopping at the Rich home again on Monday evening on his return to Wood County. He usually brought a spring wagon load of people with him. But the General Conference group at Hartford never prospered. In his old age when Daniel Rich saw that no General Conference congregation would develop, he united with the Amish Mennonite group west of Hartford.

During the summer of 1888 or 1889 a young evangelist came to conduct revival meetings at Hartford. He was a member of the Campbellite or Christian Church. At the end of the campaign (it might have been in August) people drove from miles around to witness the baptismal services in the Neosho River at Hartford.[5] Baptism was by immersion and all the candidates not previously immersed were rebaptized. The writer remembers vividly how his father was impressed by the ceremony and some of his remarks about the skillful manner in which the minister administered the rite. He stood in the river, facing the audience on the river bank, with the water about midway between his waist and his armpits. Attendants led the candidates into the water. When the candidate reached the minister, the latter in a low tone spoke a few reassuring words. Then the candidate faced the audience and clasped his hands around the left wrist of the minister. Then placing the handkerchief in his left hand over the face of the candidate and closing the nostrils, the

[5] Later the Campbellites, now known as the Christian Church, installed a baptistry in the church. Mrs. B. B. Stoltzfus states that she and her husband were baptized in the church.

minister rested his right hand behind the candidate's back and deftly but firmly lowered the candidate backward into the water. None of the candidates struggled or coughed. When the new member returned to the bank, attendants quickly threw a loose-fitting robe around him to conceal the wet clinging garments. The simple ceremony was very beautiful, dignified and impressive. It was at this service that the writer first heard the baptismal hymn, "O Happy Day That Fixed My Choice." Two other memories stand out vividly in the writer's mind: the saintly expression on the slightly built young minister's face and the difficulty that one young woman candidate and the attendants had in saturating her dress so that it would not float on the water. What trifles one's memory selects for special retention!

Several circumstances contributed to the decision of the Stoltzfus relatives to return East. Poor crops and lean years were one, but hardly the determining factor. The country was wild and moral conditions not what the eastern settlers considered the proper environment for rearing a family. In the summer of 1889 a sordid family feud resulted in a murder. A rancher's son fell in love with a young woman of whom the rancher disapproved. Then the rancher hired a young man of the town to rape the girl. In consequence the brother of the girl shot the rapist on the streets of Hartford. The writer recalls hearing his parents say that a neighborhood where such crimes could occur was no fit place to rear a family.

But church conditions also were a major source of dissatisfaction. At least one reason why the eastern group had left Union County was the unhappy church situation. They were disappointed to find conditions in Lyon County, also, far from ideal. The deacon, Joseph P. Stuckey, to whom the congregation looked as a peacemaker, was himself almost constantly in trouble. He was a Frenchman of a violent temper and passionate disposition. A widower, with several sons, he married Mattie Stoltzfus, the widow of Simeon Stoltzfus and the mother of several grown children. The marriage was a very unhappy one. Perhaps the writer should warn the reader that he, as a boy, may have heard or understood only a biased version of the story. At all events Stuckey, according to report, soon showed himself jealous, selfish, and impulsive. One night he considered himself misused and threatened to "go out and freeze" himself. On being told by his wife to "go ahead," he actually did remain out in the bitter cold for some time. When he returned, he replied in answer to a question as to why he had not remained out that

it was "too cold." Later he complained of chronic ill health and attributed it to having "frozen his liver."

He was rash in his speech. On one occasion while showing a neighbor an especially fine field of oats he exclaimed, "Ei guck! der Herr lasst mir mehr Hafer wachsen als recht ist!" (Just look! the Lord lets more oats grow for me than is right.) That night a hail storm beat the oats into the ground. He was unable to harvest any of it.

His boys also caused trouble and were in difficulty more than once. One day they were playing in the barn with matches, set fire to the building, and burned not only the barn but the horses. The writer's father took his family to the place to teach an object lesson. The writer recalls vividly his horror at seeing the charred blackened ruins of the stable, and the swollen, sprawling, scorched bodies of the horses. He never was tempted to play with matches!

Deacon Stuckey also was accused of certain business irregularities and of uttering falsehoods when he was called to account in an *Artningsgma* (Ordnungs Gemeinde), an examination meeting, held at a private home four miles west of Hartford on a certain Saturday. The boys and girls played outdoors while the meeting was held in the house. Suddenly Frank Umble hastened out of the house, hitched his horses to his spring wagon, gathered up his family and drove off rapidly to Hartford. It seems that he had been selected by the congregation to go to a certain place of business in the village to check on the truth of some of Stuckey's statements and that he had been instructed to reach Hartford ahead of Stuckey. The deacon lies buried alone in the little cemetery west of Hartford but he is said not to have been a member of the church when he died. His funeral was in charge of a Masonic Lodge and his widow and her family brought up the rear of the funeral procession. A small plain blue-gray slab marks his grave. His widow and her family moved to Herrington, Kansas.

The final dissolution of the congregation occurred years after the Stoltzfus families left in 1890 and 1891. The trouble came about, it is said, over the location of a church building. One faction wished it located in the cemetery, the other in the pasture field of one of the members. When the matter came up for a vote, the vote was nearly a tie. Then suddenly, almost without warning, all the members of the one faction moved away. That rang the death knell of the Hartford congregation.

Although the community was backward in certain respects, the Teacher's College in Emporia, the county seat, made it possible for

the local school districts to employ good teachers at very low salaries. The first teacher that the writer remembers was a Mr. Bixler, a firm but kind disciplinarian who gave his pupils a good foundation in the three R's and spelling. Then followed Ada Wilkinson, a young woman who was much interested in Friday afternoon programs of speaking and reading, but even more interested in a certain young man who occasionally visited the Friday afternoon programs and then took the teacher to her home in his buggy to spend the week end. Probably the best trained of the teachers was Ella Mosher, also a graduate of the College at Emporia, who was interested in exercises in speaking and imaginative writing but also in singing. The writer owes much to these three teachers but also to his mother and grandmother who encouraged him in his school work from the beginning. The grandmother gave him a German reader and speller when he was seven years old.

The rural school system in Kansas at that time provided for local autonomy of each school district. Both the men and the women of the district met at the schoolhouse in July or August to organize the meeting, elect three directors, decide on the school budget and tax levy and fix the salary of the teacher for the next year. The meeting at the Fairview schoolhouse always experienced considerable difficulty in persuading anyone to accept an office. On one occasion after a chairman had been elected no one would accept the office of secretary until finally a large-hearted German Catholic, named Scharff, living across the road from the schoolhouse, announced loudly and firmly, referring to his eighteen-year-old daughter, "There's Annie. He'll (sic!) do." Annie was elected and the meeting proceeded.

The man who always tried to keep down the tax levy and to hire the cheapest possible teacher was the largest landholder in the district, a rather miserly old widower who lived in a decrepit old house down by the river with his five sons. On one occasion when Annie Scharff was doing the cooking for the family for a short time, she became tired of cooking mush and of baking only corn bread. Finally she asked Mr. Osborne if he would not bring home a little sack of wheat flour. He responded, "Yes, I could but the boys don't care very much for wheat bread." At the pump a few days later after she had baked some wheat bread, she asked the boys, "Do you like white bread?" They responded emphatically, "You bet, we do." At the table a little later as she cut the bread a piece scarcely hit the plate until one of the boys had grabbed it. Finally the old gentleman said softly with well-concealed emotion, "Annie, I wouldn't cut

the bread so fast. It dries out so." It was this wealthy old gentleman's desire to keep down the school tax levy and to hire inferior teachers that always insured a good attendance at the annual meeting of the district. Fairview school district made the levy high enough to hire good teachers.

The "Yankee" families in the school district were Osborne, Hewitt, Overly, Holforty, Darbyshire, and Jones. The Amish Mennonite group included the families of John and Andrew Miller, Isaac, Jonathan, David, and Eli Stoltzfus, and a Stutzman family, Gingerichs, Whitakers, and Frank Umbles. Benjamin Stoltzfus, the youngest of the Stoltzfus brothers, united with the Christian Church in Hartford during a midsummer revival in the community when seventeen young people were baptized by immersion in the Neosho River near Hartford. The family of Dan Rich and his brother also lived in the neighborhood but did not attend church with the Amish Mennonite group.

Two Old Order Amish families had moved from Indiana, a preacher Joseph J. Borntreger and his father-in-law Moyer. In spite of this relationship the men were about the same age. Gideon Bender from Johnson County, Iowa, married one of "Joely" Borntreger's daughters. They did not attend services at the Fairview school with the Amish Mennonite group but held services in their homes every two weeks with the two families alternately entertaining the meeting. Occasionally one or more of the Amish Mennonite families would attend their services. The writer recalls attending at least one such service in the home of Preacher Borntreger. On that occasion the two Old Order Amish families were not on especially good terms. One of the grandchildren reported that "Papa couldn't come to church today because he had to stay at home to see where the turkey hen was hiding her nest."

The country at that time was still in a half wild state. On one occasion, as the writer was going to school in the morning, he saw two gray wolves cross the road several hundred yards ahead of him. Terrified he ran home, but in response to rather prompt and swift encouragement, he retraced his steps and went on to school. The next winter some animal kept disturbing the stock at night and was suspected of killing some chickens. The writer's father purchased a little strychnine, placed it in a dead chicken and left it lying among some sunflower stalks at the upper end of the farm. A few days later something moved the chicken but did not eat it. In a few days some animal buried it. Then after the wolf felt that it could no longer harm him he dug it up and ate it. My father found the dead

wolf, brought him home, skinned the animal and tanned the pelt. It was used in our home for a rug for at least forty years.

Much of the prairie was still "unbroken"—that is, it had not been touched by the plow. Deep depressions, "buffalo wallows," could be distinguished where the buffalo once had stamped and rolled in the dust to fight off the flies. The settlers used the large unfenced areas for summer pasture for their cattle and young horses. They would brand them in the spring, turn them out to the vast unbroken areas to the south, and then, when the weather grew cold and the pasture no longer palatable in the fall, they would bring them home and place them in the feed lot until spring. The writer recalls seeing his father brand the calves and colts above the right hip with a red-hot horseshoe forming a "U" easily recognized at some distance.

Wild fowl and birds of all kinds were plentiful. The prairie abounded in prairie hens, a kind of grouse, that furnished many a toothsome meal. On one occasion a flock of cranes alighted in a large field east of the writer's home. They stood in a straight line several hundred yards long flapping their wings and stretching their necks. Farmers seized their guns and rode away on horses trying to kill some of them, but the only result of their efforts was to frighten the cranes away. They were large birds standing probably three or four feet high. They once were plentiful but like the buffalo and the prairie chicken are now nearly extinct. Wild geese were plentiful. On several occasions farmers were able to shoot a wild goose. Then they would invite the neighbors in for a feast. The writer remembers one such occasion when his parents and he were invited to an "English" neighbor's home for a wild goose dinner.

The few streams, usually called rivers, abounded in fish. The Neosho River ran several miles northwest of the writer's boyhood home. He remembers accompanying his father and some neighbors one spring on a fishing trip. One group of men arranged themselves down current and stretched a huge seine or net almost across the stream. Another group went up stream with poles and paddles and waded down stream making a great deal of commotion as they did so in order to drive the fish into the net. They caught tubfuls of fish. The writer remembers how angry some of the Yankees were to find that a large part of the catch was the inedible gar fish, a long narrow sharp-nosed species. The men seized them, broke them in two and threw them on the bank. Most of the fish were of the rather coarse variety called buffalo fish somewhat resembling a carp. But

they were an appreciated change from mush and milk and fried mush.

Early spring rains often spread the waters of the Neosho River over a wide expanse of level prairie. The writer remembers one spring after a flood seeing his father, riding a small mule, returning from an early morning fishing trip with over seventy pounds of fish hanging from the horn of the saddle. He caught them all by spearing them with an ordinary four-tined manure fork in a low-lying lake-like area which the overflowing river had flooded. When the waters receded many of the fish swam around in the shallow water seeking to return to the main stream. Parts of this lake were literally alive with fins sticking up out of the water as the fish tried to find their way back to the river.

The largest fish he brought home was a huge buffalo fish weighing over fifteen pounds. The largest that he "caught" "got away" by a final desperate lunge that tore away part of his head just as he was about to be landed on the bank. Six of the fish weighed eleven pounds or over and the seventh, the smallest, weighed about five. The writer's mother in dressing the fish used a hatchet to cut off the heads. Mother always cleaned the fish at our home. If Father cleaned them, they turned his stomach so that he could not eat them. Some of the rib bones, about six inches long, Mother sent back to relatives in Pennsylvania as a curiosity. Cut into chunks and preserved in heavy salt brine, the fish made an important addition to the family food supply for a number of weeks.

The rabbits, "cottontails," were especially plentiful. One spring the writer's father, preparing a field for plowing, was dragging down the huge sunflower stalks that grew wild in this area; and, by the aid of his dog and a club, he killed nine cottontails in the forenoon. In the afternoon he took his gun with him and killed eighteen. Rabbits were so plentiful that when the farmers dressed them, they kept only the hind quarters and the back, giving the front quarters to the dog. Hung out to freeze they were a welcome addition to many an otherwise scanty meal. One day several farmers went hunting along a road where the Osage hedge had been trimmed and the brush left lying in piles along the highway. Except around the buildings the only fences were Osage hedge or barbed wire—usually only two strands of wire fastened to wooden posts. One of the men came home with thirty-two rabbits, and the other three had from fifteen to twenty-six each. The writer recalls seeing two hunters returning to Hartford from a day's hunt somewhere northwest of where he lived. They had a small homemade sled

about three feet wide and possibly six or eight feet long. The sled was rounding full of rabbits that they had killed that day.

In spite of the later dry weather and hot winds, early gardens always did well, strawberries were a good crop if they survived the previous dry summer, and dry weather vegetables like watermelons often yielded a large crop. The spring when Eli Stoltzfus broke the virgin prairie sod on his farm, someone had told him that he might raise watermelons if he scattered watermelon seeds in the furrows as he was plowing. That was the spring of the flood when the ground was too wet to plant corn until it was too late. Sometime during the summer he happened to be speaking to a neighbor, telling him that all his time and effort had been wasted. The neighbor remembered about the watermelon seeds and asked, "Didn't you even raise any watermelons?" When he went out to the field to look, he had the largest watermelons that the writer has ever seen. It would be useless to tell a present-day reader the size of the huge "Iron Clads" because the story would not be believed. Evening after evening the neighbors would gather at his home to enjoy the huge red-fleshed, black-seeded watermelons, rather coarse in texture, but very sweet and juicy.

At one time someone suggested that, since peanuts thrived in dry soil, perhaps Kansas could grow peanuts. The writer's mother planted a small patch in the truck garden the last year that they lived in Kansas and raised eight or ten bushels of peanuts. Whenever a crop did well, it did very well. During one good season one of the farmers planted potatoes by the mulching process—that is, covering them lightly with soil and then giving them a heavy cover of prairie hay. The potato yield was enormous.

During the last two seasons before the writer's parents returned to Ohio, fruit was very plentiful. The writer's father had planted an orchard of peach and apple trees, and on the north and west side he had planted a windbreak of mulberry trees. These mulberry trees and especially the peaches produced a tremendous crop of fruit during the two "good years," 1889 and 1890. The fall of 1890, after the writer's parents had decided to sell out and move to Ohio, his mother dried bushel after bushel of peaches.

Explorations in Altruistic Love and Behavior. A symposium edited by Pitirim A. Sorokin. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1950. Pp. 353. $4.00.

To those of us who assumed that science deals with material things, this volume leaves us with a feeling of "What will scientists do next?" Yet just such a study as these researchers from the Harvard Research Center in Altruistic Integration and Creativity are reporting is long overdue. The human function of reason was explored by the Greeks long ago, and the rules of logic have been applied to mathematics and science in ways that have changed the surface of this globe. Now comes a scientific party to explore the human emotions, particularly love. Is this destined to change and control human nature as we have changed and controlled nature about us? If so, this volume is to be named among the great books of the centuries.

Certain it is that the writers have set themselves to just such an ambitious task. They do not shrink from turning the searchlights on human feelings and behavior. They do not hesitate to engage in moral arithmetic.

Assuming that love is the primary energizing force, not figuratively but literally, its many aspects—religious, ethical, physical, psychological, social—are examined. Its dimensions and qualities—intensity, extensity, duration, purity, and adequacy—are outlined, and their interrelational geography described. Noting that there appears to be an inexhaustible supply of love somewhere that may be tapped, and noting, too, the necessity of applying such love to human problems to save the race, the problem of the book is stated: How can one generate and produce love-energy? How can one mobilize the human race to run such love-factories? These questions are asked as seriously as the scientists asked how one could harness electricity a century ago.

The answers, as one would expect in a symposium conducted in our present state of ignorance, are not in agreement, but all are enlightening. Specialists in their fields have explored sociology, biology, philosophy, and psychology to see what light may be thrown on this problem. Experiments have been conducted in extra-sensory perception, brain wave tracings and simple observations in mental hospitals, nursery schools and colleges to learn what makes people act friendly or hostile.

Despite this diversified source of data, there is a remarkable general agreement in a number of areas. The critical condition of humanity is taken for granted. That love, not as a mere sentiment but as effective altruism, is the answer is also taken for granted. Throughout history, what love has come through man has been largely by primitive intuition, and the family has been the chief recipient and dispenser of love. Such fragmentary deposits are insufficient to deal with the organized mass hatred on a global scale facing humanity today.

The scientists are finding that love, not hatred, is the primary emotion of mankind. Their data runs counter to current theories in vogue among present-day scientists—the Darwinian notion of survival of the fiercest, Spencerian individualism, Freudian aggression and its consequent hedonism, capitalistic emphasis on individualistic competitive success, and the Marxist doctrine of inevitable class hatred. Sociology, biology, and psychology all point to the interdependence of human beings and the common and universal need for love and mutual support. "Love thy neighbour as thyself" is found to be sound biology.

These explorers also appear to be agreed that love is a nonphysical, i.e., a spiritual force, but nonetheless a real force, capable of being studied and observed. Conservative theologians will smile at this belated neo-orthodoxy of the scientists, but will welcome the support of their meticulously tabulated data. At various times there are hints concerning the Source of all love, though understandably the matter is not pursued because it is outside the domain of scientific demonstration. As yet, the study of love must be confined to interhuman relations.

One of the disappointing chapters in the book has the challenging title "Prescription for Peace." Noting that there is something fundamentally wrong with our human thinking that makes us selfish and individualistic, Professor Burrow postulates that something has gone wrong in the human brain, that a tyrannical center which he calls the *'I'-persona* has developed—certainly a very novel explanation of the fall of man. One might expect that to be rid of such an organic brain appendage a species of brain surgery might be resorted to and the *'I'-persona* amputated to restore our original nature. I cannot describe the professor's method except in his own words as being "the replacement of the affect projection or the emotively colored mentation of the *'I'-persona* (ditention), with a sense of the neuromuscular tension that is the concomitant of this habitual behavior response." It is quite certain that St. Francis of Assisi and others achieved a love of humanity without benefit of professorial erudition. The professor is clear in what he is trying to accomplish, namely, a complete erasure of selfish and prejudiced thinking on a global scale. What makes his problem so difficult is that he tries to explain this profound change in psychophysiological terms. His prescription for peace turns out to be written in professional language.

Those who hoped that this volume would blueprint world peace will be disappointed. The task is too immense. But it is highly gratifying in this materialistic, behavioristic, individualistic civilization to find trained researchers seriously dedicating themselves to the greatest task men have ever dedicated themselves to, namely to understand the nature of man, including the nonphysical phenomena. It is encouraging to learn that the road to peace, though not blueprinted, certainly runs in the direction we had always intuitively felt it must, namely through love. It is good to know that there is so solid a core of love in the human heart. If the universe is integrated, as we have good reasons for feeling that it is, then certainly Professor Sorokin is right in saying that truth and love are related and may be transformed, the one into the other. The devotee of love welcomes truth, and for that reason welcomes this volume.

Goshen College H. Clair Amstutz.

Separated unto God. By John C. Wenger. Scottdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1951. Pp. 350. $3.75.

The Mennonite Publication Board and the General Problems Committee of the (Old) Mennonite General Conference are to be congratulated for asking one of their able scholars to devote his energies and research skill to the subject of nonconformity. It is a subject that may have been worn threadbare a generation or two ago, but it is, nevertheless, one of the most significant doctrines in the Christian church. Whenever Christians have forgotten that their conduct, individually or corporately, must be "separated unto God," the result has been gradual but certain ethical callousness and a spiritual refrigeration. The Mennonite church, in this and

in other countries, has been no exception to this generalization. Thanks be to God that there are those in our own day who sense this secularizing threat and are taking bold, positive steps to meet the problem intelligently.

Those older people who in their youth heard much preaching on the doctrine of separation and who have since been "soured" on it, owe themselves a second look at the subject *a la* Wenger, 1951. They will find a strong, intellectually respectable case made for living a positive life of Christian service. This book is anything but stuffy reading. The concerned Christian will find here a splendid piece of writing that binds the past and present neatly together. The author rests the case for Christian nonconformist behavior on careful examination of the Old Testament, the New Testament, and on Church History. Of equal value, however, are his chapters dealing with the doctrine when applied to problems of our own day. How is one to practice separation in the area of recreation, courtship, simplicity, in conversation and speech, and in the areas of business and in one's daily vocation? These are questions helpfully discussed in this book. In fact, the subject is treated with such reverence and spiritual sensitivity that the volume might well serve as a private devotional study book.

Mahatma Gandhi once said that the line between right and wrong though ever so thin is still there. This statement is recognized as basic truth and the author of *Separated unto God* has sought to focus attention to this line and to sharpen its edges. When Mennonites begin to say "yes" to the thesis of this book there will be a new and revitalized Mennonite church.

It was proper and to a certain extent a courageous decision to include a chapter that deals with the subject of separation as applied to the realm of industrial and commercial affairs. It is in this area, however, that this reviewer finds the greatest weakness of the book. There is a tendency for the author to apply the doctrine of nonconformity to purely personal practices and specific customs and to be general in the field of economics. According to scholars like Tawney, Weber, and Troeltsch, the Anabaptists did not defend the capitalistic practices as vigorously as our own historians and churchmen do today. The charging of interest and the accumulation of wealth, which means the concentration of property, were strongly opposed by Anabaptists as contrary to Christian simplicity. Today Mennonites, like all other Christians, are justifying and defending these practices. It is doubtful whether the spirit of the New Testament allows this even if the "letter" does. The Mennonite church needs badly to have a clear-cut definition and concrete suggestions of functional simplicity.

It seems to the reviewer as if Brother Wenger unconsciously identified goodness with smallness and badness with bigness. The fact is that many of the largest corporations today have high regard for human rights and genuine consideration for personality, while some of our small Mennonite businesses have little concern for basic personal needs and a tendency to pay niggardly wages and expect long hours. The author is not responsible for such conditions of course, but the Mennonite businessman in the small community must not be over-idealized.

Bethel College J. Winfield Fretz.